

THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY.

VOL. IX.

JULY, 1905.

No. 3.

GRACE.

For establishing whatever there is vital in personal Christianity, as well as for determining the exact doctrinal position of a teacher of Christianity, such Biblical concepts as "grace," "faith," and "righteousness" call for a careful inquiry and analysis. For these concepts are theological quantities of paramount value and importance that enter into the *articulus stantis atque cadentis ecclesiae*.¹⁾ Justification must remain a term of undefined extent as long as its coefficients are not exhibited in the full Scriptural value of their divinely intended meaning. According as a Christian understands, and a theologian explains, the meaning of these terms, he will hold as a net result of his efforts either a living spiritual reality, full of joy and solace, or a fantastic shadow that mocks his efforts at embrace. If the keynote of every genuine Christian hope for peace here and beyond has really been sounded, and the overshadowing issue of the Church's mission to fallen mankind has been fully stated in that momentous conclusion of the apostle: "Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith

1) "Above other matters in the Holy Scriptures the term grace, in particular, requires an explanation, not only because it is so widely used, but also because it is used in setting forth a matter by far the most important, namely, the article of justification, and, lastly, because ignorance of (the import of) this term has, before this time, occasioned the most pernicious errors." (Flacius, *Glossa*, ed. ultima, Basel, 1617; sub voce gratia, p. 370 a.)

without the deeds of the Law," then—as long as there remains a soul to be saved on earth, and a human agent appointed to save that soul—it is necessary for both to rightly understand these terms, "grace," "faith," and "righteousness."¹⁾

Entering upon a consideration of the term grace, we find, that, not the term, but the use of the term in the New Testament represents a revelation within the Revelation. An old and well-known term of classical antiquity has been taken up and filled with a new meaning. It is true, the Greeks spoke of the *χάρις*, grace, of an eloquent speaker, a beautiful woman, a skillful artist, a witty saying. They also knew that internal *χάρις* which is concretely exhibited in deeds of benevolence, favors of great men, and also in the acts of gratitude elicited by such favors. But there is no instance on record where a Greek writer has predicated *χάρις* of God in His dealing with a sinner, no instance where *χάρις* represents the established conduct of God towards, and the appointed relation of God with, the sinner, no instance of the *χάρις σωτήριος*,²⁾ of which the apostle states that it "hath appeared," stepped forth like a new star out of the depth of the heavens into the reach of human vision, when Christ came, "the God of all grace."

The term *χάρις* had been used before Christ and the apostles in the sacred language of the Church, by the Septuagint translators of the Old Testament. But in their use of *χάρις* for rendering the Hebrew *יָרַח* they did not advance

1) "I am often wont to wonder greatly, among other errors and abuses of popery, especially at this one, that in setting forth the doctrine of justification they have employed no care and diligence whatever to understand and expound what those terms of primary importance in the Holy Scriptures signify, viz., righteousness, justification, faith, grace, repentance, imputation, acceptance, salvation, sacrifice, Mediator, life, and similar terms; but have, in an arbitrary manner, as their fancy bade them, paraphrased them, giving them now this meaning, now that, without offering any proof to confirm their view." (Ibid., p. 374a.)

2) Tit. 2, 11.

beyond the use of this word by profane Greek writers; for π is rarely more than what the Greeks knew as $\chi\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\varsigma$, external grace or friendly favor, or grateful acknowledgment. The notion of a free and deliberate loving inclination of the Supreme Being towards a miscreant whom He had already cursed is not contained in π , but rather in $\rho\eta$, which the Septuagint have rendered by $\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$; and $\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ is distinct from $\chi\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\varsigma$ in New Testament Greek, as is seen by a reference to Tit. 1, 4,¹⁾ where both attributes are predicated of God. It is, indeed, as Cremer has declared: the old term $\chi\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\varsigma$, like an old, worn coin, issues from the hands of Christ and Paul, as it were, newly minted, recast. It has become a different term, so that one is tempted to say, this word $\chi\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\varsigma$ has "had to wait for the advent of Christianity to find a valuation corresponding to its proper meaning and an adequate sphere of action."²⁾

Passing by such passages of the New Testament where $\chi\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\varsigma$ is predicated of men and evidently denotes some commendable quality or merit in persons,³⁾ it has been noted that in the $\chi\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\varsigma$ $\theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$, as used in the New Testament, three features stand out prominently. In the first place, it is germane to the notion of grace that it is *an act of free volition*, a self-prompting induced by love, not compelled by any foreign agent. In Eph. 2, 7 we find grace, $\chi\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\varsigma$, coupled with kindness, $\chi\eta\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\tau\eta\varsigma$: "That in the ages to

1) Also 2 John 3. 1 Tim. 1, 2. 2 Tim. 1, 2.

2) See *Woerterbuch*, 7. ed., sub voce, p. 939. 937.

3) *E. g.*, Luke 2, 52: "Jesus increased in wisdom, and stature, and in favor ($\chi\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\varsigma$) with God and man." (BENGEL: "According to the human nature and according to the wisdom of human nature, and that, in a real manner, however, far beyond the measure of common man. His mind increased in wisdom, His body grew with the increase of years. He attained a proper and comely stature. By such parts of the mind and body youths commend themselves to favor.") Acts 2, 47: the Christians at Jerusalem "had favor ($\chi\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\varsigma$) with all the people," *i. e.*, they were well liked. Luke 6, 32 ff.: "If ye love them which love you, what thank have ye?" $\pi\omicron\iota\alpha$ $\upsilon\mu\acute{\iota}\nu$ $\chi\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\varsigma$ $\epsilon\sigma\tau\acute{\iota}\nu$; *i. e.*, what merit would there be in such action? Comp. 1 Pet. 2, 19: "This is thankworthy," $\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron$ $\gamma\alpha\rho$ $\chi\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\varsigma$, *i. e.*, this is commendable.

come He might show the exceeding riches of His grace in His kindness toward us." God, in or from His kindness, kindly, has manifested grace. Grace has welled up spontaneously out of His essence, which is all goodness, benevolence, love. The good will and good pleasure of God is the fountain from which His grace springs and is fed. God's kindness is an *attributum voluntatis*. The divine will, however, admits of no *causa formaliter causans*,¹⁾ no prompting motive other than itself. This feature of χάρις is strongly emphasized in Romans. Throughout the apostle's dissertation on justification "grace" and "merit" are placed in opposition. Because the righteousness of the believer is obtained by faith, κατὰ χάριν, "of grace," therefore it cannot be κατὰ ὀφείλημα, "of debt," ch. 4, 4. 16. Death is the well-earned "wages of sin," ὀφώνια, but eternal life is the χάρισμα of God. And throughout the epistle, and again in Galatians, χάρις in the inspired logic of the apostle is the contrary of ἔργον, ὀφείλημα.

While the grace of God is not conditioned by anything good in man as measured by the standard of the Law, it is not, on the other hand, repelled, or retarded by the evil in man. On the contrary, grace goes out to the sinner, seeks him out assiduously; his very worthlessness appears to attract it, so to speak, inviting it to fill the aching voids of despair in the heart, as air rushes in to fill a vacuum. Yea, it is peremptorily stated that grace and the divine Bearer of grace have to do exclusively with the confessed sinner, the acknowledged transgressor, Matt. 9, 12. 13; 18, 11, and that, "where sin abounded, grace did much more abound," Rom. 5, 20. It was for those "without strength," "for the ungodly," that Christ died, Rom. 5, 6, and "in that," in this remarkable act, "God commendeth His love toward us," συνίστησι δὲ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ἀγάπην εἰς ἡμᾶς, v. 8. BENDEL: "συνίστησι, an elegant expression. As a rule, those are commended to us

1) Baier, ed Walther, P. I. c. 1, § 18, p. 33.

who formerly were unknown or strangers to us." (*Gnomon*, ad locum.) The "God of grace" was "the unknown God" of this sinner world, as Paul proceeded to explain, to the Athenians, Acts 17, 23. 30. 31. No honest man, acknowledging his guilt, will find it within the scope of his own reason to look for grace in Him in whom the conscience pictures to him only righteous indignation and avenging wrath. God had to convince the sinner of His grace, He had to commend Himself by a mighty act, the sacrifice of His own Son, to the sinner whom He sought. *There is a divine unreasonableness in grace.* Itself among the most lovable of God's attributes, it chooses for its correlative what is most unlovable in man. This is what St. Paul has termed "the foolishness of God" and "the weakness of God." God has chosen for His own "the foolish things," and "the weak things," and "the base things," and "the things which are despised," and "the things which are not," *i. e.*, the worthless portions of mankind, the scum and dross of humanity. This feature of divine grace proves the overthrow of all human standards of wisdom and righteousness. The world is "confounded," shocked, and bewildered, when it rises to a clear perception of all that divine grace implies, and stumbles at the proclamation of this grace as did the Jews, or laughs it to scorn, as did the Greeks.¹⁾ But with this feature of divine grace the Christian layman or teacher must thoroughly familiarize himself, and regard the term *χάρις θεοῦ* as one of the terms that have connoting power, as a term which has its proper Scriptural meaning only when considered in conjunction with another idea; or as one of the class of correlative terms, like father, monarch, shepherd. The concept "father" is necessarily joined in thought with the concept "child," that of "monarch" with the concept "subject," that of "shepherd" with the concept "flock." In a similar manner, the grace of which we are now speaking, *χάρις θεοῦ σωτήριος*, must be

1) 1 Cor. 1, 18—29.

viewed as a correlative term, compelling the speaker or listener *always to join with it in thought the idea of human sin and guilt*. If this is not done, the real force of the term *χάρις* is decreased, its value depreciated, and the term becomes, as it were, a debased coin, sterling portions of which have been removed to make room for alloy.

In Rom. 5, 21 the apostle states: "Where sin abounded, grace did much more abound: that as sin hath reigned unto death, even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life by Jesus Christ our Lord." Sin did not enter this world as an idle thing; "by sin," as a natural effect of sin, came death. And death "passed upon all men," v. 12. "Death reigned," v. 14. 17; it held sway, it exercised the rights of a sovereign. Over and against sin, we have seen, stands grace. Grace also has entered the world as an operative force. Grace has come to reign. *Grace brings with it power to break the thralldom of sin and guilt; it removes sin, and puts in its place righteousness*. It *breaks* the fetters of the old master, and *brings* freedom. Thus, the saving grace of God appears as an efficient agent; it is not a mere notion, a beautiful idea, but an engine of God for great ends. It bears to the beggar a heavenly fortune, which the apostle describes Eph. 1, 7: "According to the riches of His grace" we have "redemption through His blood, the forgiveness of sin." Ἀπολύτρωσις and ἄφεσις here appear as gifts of *χάρις*. Add to these negative blessings the positive boon mentioned in Rom. 5, 21: righteousness and life, and you have the complete contents of *χάρις* as a *positive gift*.

In this specific meaning, embracing as its chief qualities: a free, loving self-inclination on the part of God, the correlate of sin, and a definite blessing bestowed upon the sinner, *χάρις* θεοῦ throughout the New Testament appears as the principle of salvation. The meaning of the noun *χάρις* has passed into its derivative *χαρίζομαι*, cf. Col. 2, 13; 3, 13.

(To be continued.)

D.

WHAT IS LUTHERAN AND WHAT CALVINISTIC DOCTRINE IN THE ARTICLE OF ELECTION AND PREDESTINATION?

VI. PERSEVERANCE.

We have thus far shown how the articles of redemption and calling through the Gospel are spoiled by Calvin's predestination theory. The doctrines concerning the means of grace and conversion may be omitted here, because, in as far as they are affected by Calvin's doctrine of predestination, they have been treated of in preceding chapters. To complete our essay it is yet necessary to mention two points: perseverance in grace and the certainty of election.

Calvin, as a matter of course, teaches that only the elect are truly converted, though non-elected persons sometimes experience what he terms the "inferior operations of the Spirit." Of the elect he teaches that, when once converted, they can never again fall from grace. The stamp of adoption is in conversion indelibly fixed upon them, and they are brought into such a condition as to exclude every possibility of their ever again losing the grace of God. As they are absolutely elected and absolutely called, so they are absolutely secured against falling away. Hence the Calvinistic maxim: "Once in grace, always in grace." Even though the elect after conversion should neglect the means of grace and live in the most shameful sins and vices, they nevertheless, according to Calvin's theory, possess the grace of God. The seal of adoption may be obscured and weakened in them, but never totally lost. Calvin says: "We deny, however they (the elect) may be afflicted, that they ever fall and depart from that certain confidence which they had conceived in divine mercy." (Vol. 1, p. 507.) Again he says: "Nor is it to be doubted, that when Christ intercedes for all the elect, He prays for them the same as for Peter, that their faith may never fail. Hence we conclude

that they are beyond all danger of falling away, because the intercessions of the Son of God for their perseverance in piety have not been rejected. What did Christ intend we should learn from this but confidence in our perpetual security, since we have once been introduced into the number of His people?" (Vol. II, p. 186.) After stating that the elect "can neither totally nor finally fall away from the state of grace" the Presbyterian Confession says: "Nevertheless they may, through the temptation of Satan and of the world, the prevalence of corruption remaining in them, and the neglect of the means of their preservation, fall into grievous sin and for a time continue therein." (Chap. XVII, § 3.)

Our Lutheran Church does, indeed, also teach that of the elect none can be finally lost; for God's "eternal purpose can not fail or be overthrown." If elect persons do fall away, they turn to repentance again, like David and Peter. Our church does therefore not teach that elect persons, when once converted, could fall no more, but we distinctly teach that elect persons may, and often do, temporarily fall from grace. "Here are condemned such as teach, that those who have once been justified, cannot fall again." (*Augsburg Conf.*, Art. XII.) Much less, then, does our church teach such detestable doctrine as if such persons could be God's beloved children who despise the means of grace and live in sins. "Many receive the Word with joy; but afterward fall away. Luke 8, 15. But this is not because God would not grant unto those, in whom He has commenced this good work, His grace in order to perseverance; for this is contrary to St. Paul's declaration, Phil. 1, 6; but it is because they maliciously turn themselves away from the holy command again, grieve and offend the Holy Spirit, intermingle themselves with the filth of the world, and decorate the habitations of their hearts for Satan again. The latter condition of these is worse than the former." (N. M., 2d ed., p. 718.)

Hence the difference of doctrine is this:

1. Calvin teaches that in conversion the elect are brought into a condition which excludes the possibility of falling in *this* life.

We teach that not *in*, but only *after* this life the elect are in a condition which excludes the possibility of falling.

2. Calvin teaches that the elect always remain children of grace, even though after conversion they despise the Word of God and walk in the service of sin.

We teach that all who despise God's Word and walk in sin, hence also the elect, when and so long as they do this, are children of wrath.

3. According to Calvin's doctrine the righteous who turns from his righteousness shall not die.

According to our doctrine the righteous who turns from his righteousness shall die.

In support of his doctrine Calvin appeals principally to the Lord's prayer for Peter, Luke 22, 32: "I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not; and when thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren." Footing on the first part and leaving out the second part of this passage, Calvin manifests himself a perverter of the Scriptures; for the Lord does not say Peter would not fall; He says Peter would fall, but would turn to repentance again, and then he should strengthen his brethren. Much less does the Lord say that Peter would be a temple of the Holy Spirit at the same time while he was denying his Master with cursing and swearing. Certainly, if Peter was converted again, he must have fallen, he must have lost the grace of God. So this passage refutes Calvin's, and proves our Lutheran doctrine. To David Nathan did not say: Thou art the man who by premeditating, planning, and perpetrating murder and adultery didst to some extent obscure the seal of grace which is in thee; but he said: "Thou art the man that shall surely die," 2 Sam. 12, 5. 7.

The falsity of Calvin's doctrine is very manifest also from the fruits which it must produce. If it were true that

a man once converted could no more lose the grace of God, then it would only be necessary for a man to convince himself that he was once converted in order to hope for heaven while walking after the flesh. An evil doctrine will bring forth evil fruit.

VII. CERTAINTY OF ELECTION.

May we Christians be certain that we, even we, are of the number of God's elect children? May we be so positively certain that we shall not perish, but have everlasting life as to live cheerfully in this world, and to look forward to eternity with joy and gladness? That is a question of paramount importance; a question which most deeply affects the whole life of a Christian; for, since the elect only will attain to bliss,—and this no one yet believing the Bible can or will deny,—it is evident, if we could not be certain of our election we could have no certainty of salvation whatever, but must walk in darkness, looking forward to death and eternity with apprehension and fear. Therefore it is highly necessary to define our doctrine on this point, that everyone may know what certainty of election we Lutherans teach, and to show whence this certainty is obtained.

As there are three distinct doctrines of election, so also three distinct doctrines concerning the certainty of election: the Synergistic, the Lutheran, and the Calvinistic, and these three doctrines are of such a nature that anyone teaching the one of them must reject and condemn the other two. As the Lutheran and Calvinistic doctrines of the Lord's Supper are antagonistic to each other, so that the one excludes the other, even so the doctrines of the certainty of salvation. This appears so soon as these doctrines are defined and compared. To describe the three simply by giving them a name we would denominate them thus: The Synergist teaches a certainty of reasonable knowledge; the Lutheran, a certainty of faith; the Calvinist, a certainty of sensible experience. The Synergist bases his

certainty, or rather, uncertainty, on human works or performances; the Lutheran bases his certainty on the Word of God; the Calvinist bases his certainty on his heart's experience. The Synergist says: I cannot know whether I am elect and will be saved, because I do not know whether I will persevere unto the end; the Lutheran says: I know that I am elect and will be saved, because the Word of God tells me so; the Calvinist says: I know that I am elect and must be saved, because I have experienced the effectual calling of the Spirit. The Synergist teaches a conditional or doubtful certainty, with a promise like that of the Law, which promises life with the proviso: "This do, and thou shalt live;" the Lutheran teaches a positive and infallible certainty, because he teaches a certainty of faith; the Calvinist teaches an absolute certainty, because he teaches a certainty which is independent of the means of grace. We ask the reader to make a note of this last distinction, because it is decisive. The Lutheran teaches an infallible, but not an absolute certainty; the Calvinist teaches an absolute, but not an infallible certainty. The Lutheran has an infallible certainty, because based on an infallible foundation, the Word¹⁾ of God; the Calvinist has only a fallible certainty, because based on a fallible foundation, namely, his own experiences.

When we hear that Calvin teaches an absolute certainty of election and salvation, a certainty which cannot be affected by any contingencies, but which renders man absolutely sure that in no case he can be lost, but in all cases he must be saved, this might very easily make the impression of being sound and godly doctrine; for this is certainly true, the more certain a Christian is of his eternal salvation the better it is, provided only it be the right, true, divine, and not a false, deceptive certainty. But

1) If the Lutheran lets go the Word, he of course loses that infallible certainty, and no longer has any certainty at all.

when we come to examine Calvin's doctrine, we soon find that he does not teach the right, but a false certainty, which, after all, is only deceptive and which, when applied in practice, proves a very uncertain certainty.

Calvin derives his doctrine of an absolute certainty of election from the doctrine of an effectual calling and an inamissible grace. He does frequently speak as though a Christian must derive his hope of salvation from the Word of God, but he sets this aside again and manifests as his real meaning that a man is to judge of his election, not actually by the Word itself, but by the *effect* which the Word produces in him. He says: "Few, therefore, are chosen out of a multitude that are called, but not with that calling by which we say believers ought to judge of their election." (Vol. II, p. 187.) He says, believers ought to judge of their election by their effectual calling. Now Calvin himself teaches that the calling through the Word is common to all. How, then, does the effectual call which Calvin teaches distinguish itself? What is in it by which a believer can and ought to judge of his election? Calvin states it in this wise: When treating of "common faith,"¹⁾ as he styles it, he says: "But very different is the meaning of 'full assurance' (*πληροφορίας*), which is always attributed to faith in the Scriptures, and which places the goodness of God, that is clearly revealed to us, beyond all doubt. But this cannot take place, unless we have a real sense and experience of its sweetness in ourselves." (Vol. I, p. 505.) So, then, the final mark is, a man is to judge of his election by "a real sense and experience of the sweetness of God's goodness." Calvin bases the certainty of election on the experiences of man's heart. But what stability can the feelings and sensations of the heart afford? Is that an immutable foundation? May there not be a deceptive sensation of sweetness? May not the devil, transforming him-

1) Calvin distinguishes between common faith and full assurance faith.

self into an angel of light, also cause sweet experiences? May not nervous excitement produce peculiar emotions and sweet sensations? The Scriptures say, Jer. 17, 9: "The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked." And Calvin himself confesses: "The heart of man has so many recesses of vanity, and so many retreats of falsehood, and is so enveloped with fraudulent hypocrisy, that it frequently deceives even himself." (Vol. I, p. 499.) In these words Calvin gives testimony on his own doctrine that he teaches not a certain certainty, but a very uncertain certainty, a certainty which may satisfy hypocrites and infatuated fanatics, but not those afflicted hearts that want an immutable foundation to stand on. This uncertainty Calvin renders still more uncertain by teaching that the reprobate often have similar experiences as the elect. He says: "Experience shows that the reprobate are sometimes affected with emotions very similar to those of the elect, so that, in their own opinion, they in no respect differ from the elect. Wherefore it is not at all absurd, that a taste of heavenly gifts is ascribed to them by the apostle, and a temporary faith by Christ: not that they truly perceive the energy of spiritual grace and clear light of faith, but because the Lord, to render their guilt more manifest and inexcusable, insinuates Himself into their minds, as far as His goodness can be enjoyed without the Spirit of adoption." (Vol. I, p. 500.) If the reprobate experience emotions which lead them to think that they are elect, who, then, can know if not perhaps he be one of these reprobates who deceive themselves? That is certainly tearing away everything and leaving nothing definite and certain for the Christian to be led by. Against this fact Calvin could not altogether close his eyes; therefore he adds: "If anyone object that there remains, then, no further evidence by which the faithful can certainly judge of their adoption, I reply, that although there is a great similitude and affinity between the elect of God and those who are endued with

a frail and transitory faith, yet the elect possess that confidence which Paul celebrates, so as boldly to cry: Abba, Father." Is, then, the difference to be only in the degree of boldness? Is not this building on a foundation of sand?

Our Lutheran Church does not base the certainty of election on such an uncertain foundation. It teaches that the Christian derives his certainty of election and salvation from the Word of God. We are certain of our election and salvation by believing and holding fast the Word of promise. If we hold fast the Word, we have the infallible certainty of salvation; if we let go the Word, we have no certainty whatever. We Lutherans do, of course, not deny experimental religion, we most emphatically teach it, but the question is: What is the right kind of experimental religion? and shall we found the hope of our salvation on the experiences and sensations of our own heart, or on the infallible and immutable Word of God? 2 Pet. 1, 16. 18. 19 we read: "We have not followed cunningly devised fables, when we made known unto you the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, but were eye-witnesses of His majesty. And this voice which came from heaven we heard, when we were with Him in the holy mount. We have also a more sure word of prophecy." Peter argues from the smaller to the greater. The Word of prophecy, he says, is more sure than eye-sight and ear-hearing. We build our hopes on the Word of promise, which is more sure than the observations of the senses and the sensations of the heart. Therefore, whether our sensations be sweet or bitter, our feelings good or bad, this we know, when heaven and earth will pass away the Word of the Lord will abide.

But here an adherent of Calvin's doctrine might object and say: Have you never read in the Bible of the witness of the Spirit sealing the adoption on the hearts of the elect? Answer: We have read in the Bible of the witness of the Spirit, and we have also read in the Bible that the witness of the Spirit is always connected with the Word of Jesus

Christ. If the witness of the Spirit is not resulting from, in agreement with, and directing to, the Word of Christ, then the spirit witnessing in us is not the Spirit of God, but the spirit of man or the devil. The Spirit of God does not teach men to base their hopes on experiences, sensations of sweetness, and similar emotions; the right Spirit brings to remembrance the words which Jesus Christ has spoken. Of the Holy Ghost the Lord says: "He shall glorify me; for He shall receive of mine, and shall show it unto you," John 16, 14. Therefore our Lutheran Church teaches Christians to build their hopes on the Word of the Gospel, which cannot lie or deceive. That Word tells us that Jesus Christ is made unto us righteousness; that He which hath begun a good work in us will perform it until the day of Jesus Christ; that He hath chosen us in Christ before the foundation of the world. Holding the Word of divine truth in faith we have the certainty that the everlasting God is our Savior; for His own Word is our security. If, indeed, we let go the Word, then we have nothing save only a very certain uncertainty. But we let go the Word so soon as we want something else beside it to build on. Calvinists looking to themselves and their experiences want sensations of sweetness to judge by and to build on, but what foundation these afford we have before shown. But we Lutherans teach that we are not to look to ourselves or anything in us and of us, but to the Word, and if and in as far as we do look to the Word, we have divine and infallible certainty. When synergists want the certainty of reasonable calculations and Calvinists the certainty of sweet sensations, we Lutherans reject and condemn both alike and say: The Word of our God shall be sufficient unto us; this we will believe and not doubt. That this is the doctrine of our church the Confessions do not leave in doubt. Concerning the salutary use of the doctrine of election they say: "In reference to this point we should not judge according to our reason, or to the Law, or to any external

appearance; nor should we attempt to scrutinize the concealed, the hidden depths of divine predestination, but we should attend to the revealed will of God. For He has made known unto us the mystery of His will, and brought it to light through Christ that it might be preached." (N. M., 2d ed., p. 714.) What kind of certainty is derived from the Word is described in the Confessions in this wise: "In order that the hearts of persons may entertain a consolation and a hope, which are real and infallible, we refer them, as Paul does, to the divine promises of grace in Christ, and teach them that they must believe that God grants them eternal life, not on account of their work, or the fulfillment of the Law, but for the sake of Christ." (p. 210.) That faith itself is certainty the Confessions also testify: "It is faith alone in the heart that regards or takes into consideration the promises of God; faith alone is the assurance upon which the heart rests with certainty that God is merciful." (p. 184.) Hence the difference of doctrine may be summarized thus:

1. Calvin teaches an absolute certainty of election; we teach a certainty of faith.

2. Calvin bases the certainty of salvation on the experience of the Christian; we base the certainty of salvation on the divine Word of promise.

3. Calvin's doctrine is certainly productive of fanaticism; our doctrine confines men in the limits of the written Word of God.

We close our essay in the hope of having succeeded in making it plain to the reader that Calvin's doctrine of an absolute predestination unto life and unto death is essentially, radically different from our Lutheran doctrine of an election of grace, and of grace only.

F. KUEGELE.

THE RESURRECTION OF CHRIST AS PROPHESED.

“Then He took unto Him the twelve, and said unto them, Behold, we go up to Jerusalem, and all things that are written by the prophets concerning the Son of man shall be accomplished. For He shall be delivered unto the Gentiles, and shall be mocked and spitefully entreated, and spitted on: and they shall scourge Him, and put Him to death: and the third day He shall rise again,” Luke 18, 31—33. At three different times and upon three different occasions (cf. Matt. 16, 21; 17, 22) Jesus foretold His sufferings and death, and every time He concluded with a reference to His resurrection. His sufferings were foretold in many passages of the Old Testament. He “shall be mocked,” is a fulfillment of Ps. 22, 7: “All they that see me laugh me to scorn: they shoot out the lip, they shake the head.” He shall be “spitefully entreated, and spitted on: and they shall scourge Him,” is foretold Is. 50, 6. 7: “I gave my back to the smiters, and my cheeks to them that plucked off the hair; I hid not my face from shame and spitting.” “They shall put Him to death,” is stated in Is. 53, 8. 12: “He was cut off out of the land of the living, . . . He hath poured out His soul unto death.” Even so almost every circumstance, although apparently unimportant, was prophesied.

But how about His resurrection? In his statement: “All things that are written by the prophets concerning the Son of man shall be accomplished,” Christ enumerates amongst other details also this: “And the third day He shall rise again.” Accordingly, this last act also must have been foretold. Since Christ can speak nothing but the truth, we must find a prophecy concerning His resurrection. Searching the Scriptures we certainly will not find so many clear and explicit declarations regarding Christ’s resurrection as regarding His passion. But even if we found but one single passage, it would suffice to show that the resurrection also has been clearly predicted by the prophets; but we have quite a number.

Peter quotes one prophecy in his pentecostal address to the Jews from Ps. 16, 10: "For Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell; neither wilt Thou suffer Thine Holy One to see corruption." In his commentary on this Psalm Luther explains this passage thus: "Although I come into suffering and death, nevertheless my body remains uncorrupted, and my life shall not stay in hell. Hell, however, means everything, whatever it be, into which we pass after this life, be it the grave or something else. I judge, however, that *sheol* (hell) is derived from the word שְׁאֵל, which means to demand, and denotes the place which can never be satisfied, but forever wants more. The word soul means life. נַפְשׁ means a grave and corruption. Thou wilt, He says, not suffer me to see corruption, *i. e.*, that which takes place in the grave, namely, corruption. This is a very clear text on the resurrection, and cannot be understood of anyone else except of Christ; who, being holy and pure, cannot be held by death, He must rise again." (Erl. ed. 38, 143 f.) A life which is not left in hell (*sheol*), surely must come out of it again; a body which is not suffered to see corruption, *i. e.*, to decay, cannot remain in the grave. It must come out of it before corruption can set in. So Christ had to rise again from the dead, and that prior to the time in which corruption might infect His body.

To corroborate this truth and the fact that this Psalm treats of Christ, we have the testimony of the Holy Ghost by St. Peter, Acts 2, 25—27. He says: "For David speaketh concerning Him (Christ), I foresaw the Lord always before my face, for He is on my right hand, that I should not be moved: therefore did my heart rejoice, and my tongue was glad; moreover, also my flesh shall rest in hope: because Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, neither wilt Thou suffer Thine Holy One to see corruption."

Isaiah presents Christ as a living Christ after He has "made His grave with the wicked," and after He has been "with the rich in His death." He beholds Christ dead and

buried and alive again, because he says of Him: "He (the Father) shall prolong His days," ch. 53, 10. Isaiah can say this only of one who is to live again after he has died. But if he is to live again after death, he certainly must rise again from the grave. Consequently, we here have another explicit statement concerning the resurrection of Jesus.

Besides these two explicit statements of Christ's resurrection there are many passages in which Christ is presented as a living Savior. The predictions regarding His death are clear and unmistakable, for instance, Ps. 22, 15. Is. 53, 8. 9. But of this very same Christ it is asserted that He is living, living forever; His throne is established forever. But it is impossible to conceive how the Holy Spirit could by the mouths of the prophets speak of Christ, of whom He has said that He is dead, as of one living, if we were not permitted to infer from these expressions that Christ was to rise again from the dead. The same David who speaks of the death of the Messiah, Ps. 16, asserts that the Lord "will establish the throne of His kingdom for ever," 2 Sam. 7, 13, and glorifies Him, saying: "The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit Thou at my right hand, until I make Thine enemies Thy footstool," Ps. 110, 1.

The suffering Messiah, complaining: "Thou hast brought me into the dust of death," Ps. 22, 15, rejoices, saying: "I will declare Thy name unto my brethren: in the midst of the congregation will I praise Thee," Ps. 22, 22. How could this have come to pass, if He should have remained in the "dust of death"?

Daniel represents the "One like the Son of man" as receiving "dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve Him: His dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and His kingdom that which shall not be destroyed," ch. 7, 13 f. So Jesus must live, for He is the "Son of man." Yet, this "Son of man" must die and be buried, and it would be preposterous to ascribe to Him an "everlasting do-

minion" if He were to remain dead. The dead have no dominion; it is only the living that exercise power.

Christ is to bruise the Serpent's head, although the Serpent is to bruise His heel, Gen. 3, 15. Christ is to suffer death at the hands of the devil, but at the same time He shall destroy the power of Satan. A dead Christ, however, cannot destroy the power of Satan. If Christ would have been held captive by the grave, He would have been the one that had lost the battle with the powers of hell. Wherever Christ is spoken of as living forever, as exercising everlasting power, as having everlasting dominion, His resurrection is presupposed. His resurrection is a fact well known to the "holy men of God."

All the believers of the Old Covenant hoped in the Messiah. They trusted in Him that He would raise their bodies again from the dead. Job in his troubles comforts himself with the words: "I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that He shall stand at the latter day upon the earth," ch. 19, 25. What a fool Job would have been to hope in a dead Redeemer! But he knew better. Looking forward to the end of time, he beholds his Redeemer living and standing upon his grave to call him forth to new life and everlasting bliss.

Finally, David beholds Christ ascending into heaven and rejoices: "Thou hast ascended on high, Thou hast led captivity captive," Ps. 68, 18. And again: "God is gone up with a shout, the Lord with the sound of a trumpet." "God reigneth over the heathen; God sitteth upon the throne of His holiness," Ps. 47, 6. 8.

The resurrection of Christ is well established in the Old Testament. As His sufferings and death were prophesied and fulfilled, even so His resurrection. And knowing and believing that He "was delivered for our offenses, and raised again for our justification," we may triumph with St. Paul: "O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory? The sting of death is sin: and the strength of sin is the Law. But thanks be to God, which giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ," 1 Cor. 15, 55—57. W. L.

THE WYCLIFFITE VERSIONS OF THE BIBLE.¹⁾

It is singularly appropriate that John Wyclif, the Oxford schoolman who became "the Morning Star of the Reformation," should have been surnamed, by way of distinction, "the Evangelical Doctor." Although he first obtained fame and the friendship of princes in the political arena, as a sturdy champion of national rights against Romish aggression, refuting with his keen-edged dialectics the papal claim of feudatory tribute, nevertheless the corruption and ignorance of the clergy and the criminal neglect of pastoral care in days when pestilence and famine thinned the ranks of men and when social discontent was everywhere rife, together with the scandal of the Great Schism, when the rival popes of Rome and Avignon hurled anathemas at one another, led Wyclif to examine Popery in the light of the divine Word, and to see with increasing clearness in the Roman pontiff the features of Antichrist. This was for Wyclif a time for searching the Scriptures, which led him to abandon many false doctrines and idolatrous practices of ecclesiastical tradition, and to establish doctrine on the basis of "Goddiss law." Even if he failed in some instances to penetrate to the true meaning of Holy Writ, if, to mention an instance, his doctrine of the Eucharist is unscriptural, and if his religious reforms were strongly tinged with political aims, he yet deserves the credit of clearly realizing that a reformation could only be brought about by means of the Gospel. This conviction gave birth to his demand for

1) Bibliography:—Forshall and Madden, *The Holy Bible, by John Wycliffe and His Followers*. (4 vols. Oxford, 1850.) W. W. Skeat, *The New Testament*. (Reprint from F. and M.'s ed.) (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1879.) F. A. Gasquet, *The Old English Bible*. (1897.) F. D. Matthew, in *The English Historical Review*. (January, 1895.) G. M. Trevelyan, *England in the Age of Wycliffe*. (1900.) W. W. Capes, *The English Church in the 14th and 15th Centuries*. (1900.) "Dr. Gasquet and the Old English Bible," in *The Church Quarterly Review*. (October, 1900; January, 1901.) Jos. Carr, *Ueber das Verhältniss der Wyclifitischen und der Purveyschen Bibelübersetzungen zur Vulgata und zu einander*.

a vernacular Bible, which he at once set about to supply, with the aid of his Oxford friends, by his translation, and sought to make generally useful by training and sending forth his "poor priests" to preach the Gospel to the common people in their own tongue.

This venerable monument of the early English reformatory movement has been preserved to us. A fourteenth century Bible, extant in 170 manuscripts that represent an earlier and a revised version, was first published in its entirety in Forshall and Madden's four-volume edition, 1850. Tradition had declared this to be the Wyclif Bible, and the learned editors, after devoting twenty-two years to their labor and examining the evidence in the case, unhesitatingly acknowledged its Wycliffite authorship. Here the case rested until Dom. Gasquet, a learned English Benedictine, in the *Dublin Review*, July, 1894, took up a dissenting opinion that had already been voiced in the same magazine (1853), and formulated the astounding theory that the Bible in question, so far from being Wycliffite, was in reality an authorized Roman Catholic version. It should be observed that Dr. Gasquet submitted no evidence that was not known to Forshall and Madden, and his theory is due to imperfect command of the evidence and to adroit manipulation of authorities. He minimized Wyclif's claim to the authorship by contending, in the face of overwhelming testimony to the contrary, that neither the Reformer nor his adherents laid any stress on the promulgation of the Scriptures in the vernacular. He then endeavors to show that the attitude of the Church was not hostile to translations into the popular speech, and establishes a presumption in favor of his thesis by quoting from Sir Thomas More, Archbishop Cranmer, and Foxe to the effect that an orthodox version was supposed to exist. If, then, the Wycliffites had no Bible, and the Catholics had one, then this so-called Wycliffite book is it; for it is perfectly orthodox, not glossed or garbled as Lollard texts would have been; it is often extant in sump-

tuous copies such as poor Lollards could never have produced; and it is generally found in the possession of good Catholics.

Let us examine the evidence that led the Catholic historian to assume the existence of a Catholic version. He had read in the *Dialogues* of Sir Thomas More the well-known words: "As for old translations, before Wyclif's time, they remain lawful and be in some folks hands. Myself have seen and can show you, Bibles, fair and old, in English which have been known and seen by the Bishop of the Diocese and left in laymans hands and womens;" and: "The whole Bible was long before his [*i. e.*, Wyclif's] days by virtuous and well learned men, translated into the English tongue and by good and godly people with devotion, and soberness, well and reverently read." Again he had read Archbishop Cranmer's statement in the prologue to the second edition of the Great Bible: "If the matter should be tried by custom, we might also allege custom for the reading of the Scripture in the vulgar tongue, and prescribe the more ancient custom. For it is not much above one hundred years ago, since Scripture hath not been accustomed to be read in the vulgar tongue within this realm, and many hundred years before that, it was translated and read in the Saxon tongue, which at that time was our mother tongue, and when this language waxed old and out of common usage, because folk should not lack the fruit of reading, it was again translated into the newer language whereof yet also many copies remain and be daily found." He had also read what Foxe, the martyrologist, wrote in his dedication of his edition of the Saxon Gospels to Archbishop Parker: "If histories be well examined we shall find both before the Conquest and after, as well before John Wycliffe was born as since, the whole body of the Scriptures was by sundry men translated into our country tongue." This is the evidence.

Now, Foxe's testimony is manifestly unreliable, since there never was a translation of the whole Bible before

Wyclif's days. The same criticism applies to More's statement. Hence if More's Bibles really were older than Wyclif, they must have been translations of parts only, perhaps the Gospels or the Psalter, which might, of course, be called Bibles. If, however, he saw one or the other of the versions under consideration, he was evidently mistaken as to their date, and took one of the two Wycliffite versions for a Catholic one. At all events, his testimony only speaks of a Bible that was licensed. As we shall see later, the Wyclif Bible was thus licensed, and hence from More's remarks nothing follows but that the possession of Bibles was not general, and that here and there men had the bishop's license to own them. Cranmer, likewise, furnishes clear evidence that from the first half of the fifteenth century, the period following these versions, for a hundred years the Bible was not "accustomed to be read," and that in his day they were daily—mark the word—"found." Now, to posit seriously the existence of a Catholic Bible we should wish rather more distinct evidence. We should wish to see some decree authorizing a version, some individual or a body of men commissioned to execute the work; we should expect some contemporary writer speaking of such a translation as being in progress or receiving encouragement.

But while we set aside this superlatively mild evidence as not warranting the inference, may not many records have been lost and Dr. Gasquet's claim of a Catholic version, after all, be less romantic than it appears? He combats the idea that the spirit of revolt prompted vernacular versions, and contends that the clergy, so far from being hostile, was favorable to such translations. What, then, was the attitude of the Church? The early fathers had advocated Bible reading by the people. Witness the various Latin translations. The earliest monument of Germanic literature is the translation of the Scriptures for his people by Wulfilas the Goth in the fourth century. Gregory the Great (590 to 604), the father of early medieval theology, requires ac-

quaintance with Holy Writ not only from those in holy orders, but also from all Christians, on account of the importance of Scripture for obtaining grace, and is the author of the beautiful dictum that God's Word is a stream both shallow and deep, so that, while a lamb can wade in it, an elephant may swim in it. But already in the Anglo-Saxon period we discern a very pronounced change. Even then the Catholic Church did not desire the believer to see in the Bible anything more than a book for pious edification. Beyond the regular Lessons and the homilies based on them, occasionally turned into verse, little was known of the Scriptures by the people at large. There were, of course, versions of portions of the sacred text, chiefly of the Psalms and the Gospels, intended mainly for use in the services and for the private devotion of holy men. Even Aelfric, who wrote translations for his friend, the ealdorman Aethelweard, hedges and apologizes for yielding to the importunities of believing men. King Aelfred was perhaps the only man that conceived the idea of giving the Bible to the people in their own tongue, but he did not live to carry out the project. The translations of the Middle English period, such as Shoreham's and Hampole's Psalters, bear the same devotional character. Hence though there were versions "emanating from Catholic sources," they were not intended for popular use.—Add to this that the attitude of the Church on this question had been clearly defined long before Wyclif's time. The Council of Toulouse had decreed in 1229: "We also forbid the laity to possess any of the books of the Old or New Testaments, except perhaps some one out of devotion wishes to have the Psalter or Breviary for the divine offices, or the hours of the Blessed Virgin. But we strictly forbid them having any of these books translated into the vulgar tongue." It is not known that the Church ever repudiated this canon, and the Council of Trent continued to legislate in the same spirit. Soon the friars (*Domini canes*) were on the trail of

transgressors to bring them before the tribunals of the Inquisition. From such a temper no one will suspect bishops of giving orders for a translation of the Bible and of spreading it broadcast. But it causes no surprise to hear that, for example, a synod at Treves, in 1231, condemned early translations; and the inference is legitimate that these versions did not emanate from "good Catholic sources." Where the Church permitted translations they were for men in orders, or reluctant concessions to demands that could not be gainsaid. On the continent, laymen occasionally made their own translations in conscious opposition to the clergy. The reformatory movements that were beginning to react against the Church are so clearly connected with vernacular versions that we are constrained to ascribe these versions to "the spirit of revolt," and credit the Roman church with hostility to such undertakings.

With these considerations in mind, we approach the England of the closing decades of the fourteenth century, the years that produced our versions. Dr. Gasquet alleges that the English Church authorities only sought to safeguard the doctrine of the Church, but for the rest, if anything, favored the translation and dissemination of the Bible in the language of the people. As a matter of fact, the bishops had a Bill introduced into Parliament in 1391 to forbid the circulation of the English Scriptures. But John of Gaunt, the Duke of Lancaster, Wyclif's friend, answered right sharply: "We will not be the refuse of all other nations; for since they have God's law, which is the law of our belief, in their own language, we will have ours in English whoever say nay." Knighton, a contemporary chronicler, would seem to echo the sentiment of the clergy; for, speaking of Wyclif's Bible, he says: "So what is wont to be precious to clerks and layman is now rendered as it were the common jest of both, and the jewel of clerks is turned into the sport of layman." Having failed in her effort to have Wyclif's book crushed by the State, the

Church on her own part, under Archbishop Arundel, in 1408, legislated as follows: "It is a dangerous matter, by the witness of Blessed Jerome, to translate the text of Holy Scripture from one idiom into another, forasmuch as, in such translations, the same sense is not in all things easily preserved. The same Blessed Jerome, though he were inspired, admits that he had often erred in this. We command, therefore, and ordain that henceforth no one, of his own authority, translate any text of Holy Scripture into the English language or another, by way of book, booklet, or treatise: And that no such book, booklet, or treatise lately composed in the time of the said John Wyclif, or since, or that may hereafter be composed, be read, in part or wholly, in public or in secret, under pain of the greater excommunication: until, by the diocesan of the place, or, if necessary, by a Provincial Council, the translation shall have been approved. He who shall act otherwise is to be similarly punished as an abettor of heresy and error." (Wilkins, *Concilia*, III, 317.) This provision, enacted at Oxford, does not approve and does not prohibit Wyclif's version; but it does arm the bishops with discretionary power in dealing with it. There is room for a vast deal of hostility behind this decree. And while it gave the bishops latitude to grant licenses to certain persons to possess this Bible, it was, in the main, an instrument to limit its circulation. There is no reason to disbelieve the words of the Prologue, p. 30: "And worldly prelatis and feyned relygious grounden hem on synful men-nis statutis, that sounnen pride and coueitise, and letten [hinder] the treuthe and fredom of Goddis lawe to be knowen and kept, and bringen cristen puple in nedeles thraldom and greet cost;" or when it speaks (p. 43) of "lordis and prestis, that wolen compelle men, for drede of prisoun and deth, to forsake the treuthe and fredom of Cris-tis gospel." Thus John Stafford, bishop of Bath and Wells, prohibits translations or the copying of translations under threat of excommunication (1431), and he makes no reser-

vation in favor of an authorized version. In fact, no enactment of any kind proves the good will of the clergy. Moreover, had there been an authorized version, Caxton, instead of contenting himself with printing the *Golden Legend*, would assuredly have considered the Scriptures far more marketable; but the Bible was never printed. The attitude of the clergy was uniformly hostile, and this agrees well with what we learned from Cranmer, that for more than a hundred years before his day the Scriptures were little read.

There is small evidence, then, for the existence of an hypothetical Catholic Bible. Yet a Roman writer has unearthed such a Bible, and invites us to acknowledge that the unexpected has happened. But our curiosity passes into amazement as we behold, not a new discovery at all, but the old Wyclif Bible, merely labeled Roman Catholic. Now it is obvious, if Dr. Gasquet carries his point, then either there was no Wycliffite version or it was lost; and if he fails to do so, then there was no Roman Catholic version. He sets forth his theory with admirable audacity and no little plausibility.

1) "Had the version been the work of Lollard pens, we might have looked for texts strained or glossed to suit their well-known conclusions." Since, however, the extant manuscripts of the Wyclif Bible show a plain rendering of the Latin text of the Vulgate then current, thoroughly orthodox, without any heretical bias, the version manifestly was not Wyclif's at all, but authorized by Mother Church.

2) "Many of these copies are written with great care and exactness, and illuminated with colored borders executed by skillful artists." Since "these must surely have been the productions of freer hands than the followers of Wyclif ever were allowed to have in England," again the version must have been sanctioned by the Catholic authorities.

3) Good Catholics possessed copies of this Bible. "Is it likely that men of position, of unquestioned orthodoxy,

and of undoubted hostility to Lollard aims and opinions, would have cherished the possession of copies of a Wycliffite Bible?" Ergo—.

To begin with the second argument, it may be stated that the earliest manuscripts are practically devoid of ornament, and that many of the less ornate volumes, such as were actually used by the heretics, were destroyed. The argument shows no more than that such Bibles were owned also by rich people. It is certain, however, that Wyclif, who had preached disendowment, the secularization of Church lands, and resistance to papal rapacity, from first to last had many staunch and influential supporters and protectors. At one time the Queen Mother forbade decisive measures against him. It would seem, too, that Anne of Bohemia, who became King Richard's queen in 1382, favored Wyclif; for her countrymen, passing to and fro between Bohemia and England after this union, introduced Wyclif's writings into Bohemia, where they produced the Hussite movement and were preserved to our days. The English Bible she read was clearly Wyclif's. Although his heresy on the Eucharist more or less alienated the sympathies of the Court and the nobility, yet throughout the kingdom many of the gentry favored Wyclifism, and the "heresiarch" remained unmolested to the end as rector of Lutterworth. When, in 1395, certain Lollard members of the Privy Council had failed to influence King Richard in favor of their coreligionists, they took advantage of his absence in Ireland to lay their opinions before Parliament. The leaders in this affair were Sir Richard Stury and Sir Lewis Clifford, Privy Councillors, Thomas Latimer, the powerful Northamptonshire landlord who had helped the Wycliffites on his own estates, and Lord John Montagu, brother of the Earl of Salisbury. And not only did such powerful men befriend Wyclif's cause, but even a number of bishops suffered Lollardy to grow up in their sees. Leicestershire, the counties bordering on Wales, and London, were Lollard centers.

Wyclif himself says: "One comfort is of knights, that they savour much the gospel and have will to read in English the gospel of Christ's life." Now granting that a Wyclif Bible existed, then surely many of this large class of sympathizers would wish to own one, and possess ample means to have sumptuous vellum copies illuminated and handsomely set forth in colors and gold.

The other two arguments, likewise, can be quite readily answered. Is it fair to deny the attribution of a version upon no other ground than that it is faithful? It requires sturdy prejudice to believe that men who drew their conclusions from the Scriptures, who hazarded their lives in professing the truths drawn from these Scriptures, who undertook the laborious task of turning into the vernacular this their most sacred treasure, should have dared to handle the inspired volume save with the utmost reverence for the literal meaning of every text, to tamper with Holy Writ to suit their own ends. Any departure from the text, furthermore, would have been an act of extreme folly, since any friar with a tincture of Latin would have been able to discredit the performance.

But while every consideration of conviction and policy would determine translator and scribe to deviate as little as possible from the received text, there was not, as in printed Bibles, a stereotyped form. The text varied very little, but "prologues" were added, in which were contained the Wycliffite application of Scripture to the burning questions of the day, or what the Church regarded as heresy. Bearing in mind the existence and character of these "prologues," we are in a position to understand the operation of the Oxford canon. The discretionary power there given to the bishops enabled them either to approve or to condemn such Bibles as came under their notice. The records show that certain *persons* were authorized to possess certain *copies* that had been inspected. The action of the bishop depended on the character of the petitioner and the character of the

book presented. If any priest or man of rank submitted a manuscript, that very act was *prima facie* evidence of orthodoxy. Where, however, the books were owned by men of humble station and were not submitted, it was safe to assume a taint of heresy. In dealing with men of power, the bishops would deem it wise to make a virtue of necessity, and grant a license. Many of the volumes were perfectly harmless, since the translation contained no heresy. Those copies that had the prologue could easily be rendered inoffensive by removing the obnoxious prologue. A Bible might thus remain as an ornament to some great man's library or for the devotional use of pious priests and nuns. When once good Catholics owned such Bibles with the approval of their bishop, they in course of time forgot that the translation had originally been made by heretics. In some copies, traces of the heretical prologue survive in spite of episcopal vigilance. King Henry VI, "enthusiastic in the cause of religion," possessed "a finely-executed vellum folio copy of the Scriptures, with illuminated borders," and he gave it to the monks of the London Charterhouse; hence, it is argued, it must have been known as a perfectly orthodox translation of the English Church. But the recto of the first leaf is found to have been filled with a portion of the "General Prologue" prefixed to Purvey's translation. Hence it was a Wycliffite book. Indeed, the whole Prologue has been preserved. It was not always necessary to destroy it. It might even be desirable to have a few heretical books within reach. The Convent of our Lady of Syon owned a copy of Wyclif's Bible, and, according to the library catalogue, the good sisters possessed among their literary treasures a little series of Wyclif's own writings, including even a work, *De Sacramento Altaris, cum aliis, de quibus cavendum est*. Also Bishop Bonner owned a Lollard Bible, and knew what it was. The following passage from Purvey's Prologue clearly shows that it was Wycliffite: "To absteyne fro ootheris nedeles and unleeueful, and to eschewe

pride, and speke onour of God and of His lawe, and repreue synne bi weie of charite, is matir and cause now whi prelatis and summe lordis sclaudren men, and clepen hem lollardis, eretikis, etc." (p. 33.) The strongest proof of the Wycliffite character of these versions, however, is found in the Bible of Richard Hun, which was burned in London in 1514. Thomas More sets it down as a Lollard book, because in the "prologue" there were heresies. The thirteen articles, extracted from this "prologue" and read to the people at Paul's Cross, and preserved in the Register of Fitzjames, Bishop of London, were printed by Foxe in his *Acts and Monuments*, IV, 186. And these thirteen heretical articles may be read, often verbatim, in the "Prologue" published in Forshall and Madden's edition. It is unnecessary to quote more than one. "First, The said book damneth all holy canons, calling them ceremonies and statutes of sinful men and uncunning, and calleth the Pope Satan, and Antichrist." (Foxe.) "It semith opyn heresie to seie, that the gospel with his treuthe and fredom suffisith not to salvacioun of cristen men without kepyng of ceremonies and statutis of sinful men and unkunynge, that ben maad in the tyme of Sathanas and of Antecrist." (Prologue, p. 3.)

Since, on Dr. Gasquet's own admission, the version and the "prologue" are by the same hand, nothing remains to be said. There was no Catholic version. The very fact that licenses were issued bears witness to its absence. The bishops simply appropriated the work of their opponents. Compelled to sacrifice the "Prologue," the Gasquet school still claims at least the version itself as a Catholic performance. (*Cath. World*, 1904, pp. 791—796.)

It is now time to present the evidence that speaks for the Wycliffite authorship. Huss, in his *Replica contra Jo. Stokes*, 1411, writes: "Per Anglicos dicitur, quod ipse tota Biblia transtulit de Latino in Anglicum." We have already had occasion to quote the decree of the Council of

Oxford, 1408, in which it is clearly implied that Wyclif was connected with some Bible version. Both Lyndewood, "the great fifteenth century canonist," and Sir Thomas More interpret the words of this constitution as referring to a translation of the Scriptures. A very weighty authority is the contemporary chronicler Henry Knighton, who says: "The Gospel which Christ committed [*contulit*] to clerks and doctors of the Church, that *they* might sweetly minister, as time and particular need required, to the lay and feebler folk, eager of appetite: [that Gospel] did this master John Wyclif translate [*transtulit*] from the Latin into the English tongue—the Angle, not the angel speech—and thence, by his means, it is become vulgar, and more open to laymen, and women who can read, than it is wont to be to clerks well-lettered and of good understanding; and so the gospel pearl is scattered and trodden under foot of swine; and so what is wont to be precious to clerks and laymen is now rendered as it were the common jest of both, and the jewel of clerks is turned into the sport of laymen." (*Chronicon Henrici Knighton, monachi Leycestrensis*, ed. J. R. Lumby, Rolls Ser. II, 151 f.) In the letter of Archbishop Arundel and his suffragans to John XXIII, in 1412, the English primate is explicit enough. "Hic enim est ille pestilens et damnandae memoriae miserrimus Johannes Wycliff, serpentis antiqui filius, imo et ipsius Antichristi praeuius et alumnus . . . quin immo et ipsam ecclesiae sacrosanctae fidem et doctrinam sanctissimam totis conatibus impugnare studuit, novae ad suae malitiae complementum scripturarum in linguam maternam translationis practica adinventum." (Wilkins, *Concilia*, III, 350.) If we add that the manuscripts show such leading Wycliffites as Hereford and Purvey to have been connected with the version, that the later or revised text is found to be Purvey's, Wyclif's curate at Lutterworth, and that these very versions, together with Wyclif's followers, were persecuted by the Church, it seems clear that, while no other name has ever been mentioned as

deserving the honor of this translation, there is sufficient contemporary evidence to support the tradition of its Wycliffite origin.

Although the Reformer personally, at most, did only a part of the earlier version, he was, nevertheless, the soul of the enterprise. He is never tired of advocating the spread of the Scriptures in the vernacular. His writings abound with passages like the following: "Thus it helpeth here to Christian men to study the Gospel in that tongue in which they know best Christ's sentence." (*Sel. E. W.*, III, 184.) Since he and his assistants were Oxford men, it has been suggested to call their work the "Oxford" version. Wyclif is thought to have rendered the New Testament. To the text of the Gospels, extracted from his commentary upon them, were added, in new translations, the Epistles, the Acts, and the Apocalypse. The similarity in style between the New Testament books favors the supposition that they were done by Wyclif himself. Meanwhile one of his coadjutors was probably at work upon the Old Testament. The original copy of this translator, corrected throughout by a contemporary hand, is still extant in the Bodleyan Library, Oxford. A second copy in the same library was transcribed from the former previously to its correction, and in a note at the end assigns the translation to Nicholas of Hereford. Both end abruptly at *Baruch* 3, 20. Hereford was one of the leaders of the Lollard movement at Oxford, and his labors on the Old Testament seem to have been suddenly interrupted by the summons he received to appear before synod in 1382. Excommunicated for holding heretical opinions, he went to Rome to appeal to the Pope, and again became an obedient son of the Church. To judge from the nature of the translation, Wyclif himself finished the Old Testament. This earlier version being unsatisfactory by reason of its literalness, a revision was undertaken, no doubt with the concurrence and, perhaps, at the suggestion of Wyclif, who, however, did not live to see it completed,

having departed this life in 1384. This revision contains a prologue, in which the author sets forth the purpose and method of his work. In it he speaks of the Bible "of late translated" as requiring correction, and from the rules laid down by him the corrected version can be conclusively identified. He calls himself only "a simple creature." From allusions to contemporary events the date of the Prologue may with some degree of certainty be fixed at 1388. After Wyclif's death, his curate at Lutterworth, John Purvey, was the most prominent Lollard leader; hence it was natural to ascribe the version to him. A volume in Trinity College, Dublin, contains the Prologue in Purvey's own handwriting. Moreover, the General Prologue agrees closely in style, language, arguments, manner of quotation, and authorities quoted with the *Ecclesiae Regimen, or Thirty-seven Articles against Corruptions in the Church*, a treatise attributed upon most reliable grounds to John Purvey. It follows that Purvey was the author not only of the Prologue, but also of the revision of the text itself, inasmuch as the latter was evidently by the same hand. This revision is everywhere founded upon the previous translation, and presents but few substantial differences of interpretation.

Turning now to speak of the character of this translation, we may observe that, being a version of a version, it would, of course, perpetuate the errors of the Vulgate. Hereford has left traces of his Southern dialect in his work, and Wyclif has not altogether forgotten his native Northern speech. The general character, however, is East Midland as it was spoken about Oxford. Purvey's revision employed throughout the popular East Midland dialect. The two versions differ largely as to vocabulary and style. The fault of Hereford's translation was his servile adherence to the Latin Vulgate. Rendering word for word and observing even the order of words in the original, he produced constructions that were quite foreign to the English idiom, often involved and difficult, occasionally obscure, and at times incorrect.

While Wyclif offended less in this respect, even his style was strongly Latinized and required Englishing. He renders Latin words by forms etymologically related: V. *ministraverit*. W. schal mynistr. P. serue. John 12, 26. Wyclif is strongly influenced by Latin in the use of particles. Thus he translates *autem*, as a rule, with *forsothe* or *sothli*; while Purvey renders it with *but*, *and*, *for*, *therefor*, or not at all, according to the exigencies of English usage. Wyclif's translation, in general, is nearer to the Anglo-Saxon than Purvey's, which is only rarely the more archaic. Another peculiarity of Wyclif's version, as distinguished from Purvey's, is his use of parallel readings: V. *animam*. W. his soule, that is, lyf. Occasionally Purvey corrects an error of Wyclif's. V. *in Cana Galilaeae*. W. in the Cane, or town, of Galilee. P. in the Cane of Galilee. John 2, 1. Upon the whole, the percentage of non-Germanic words is greater in Wyclif than in Purvey. Wyclif's syntax is even more Latin than his vocabulary. In Purvey's version the most awkward of these Latinisms are, to a great part, expunged. Thus Wyclif often retains the Latin tenses, whereas Purvey strives to find the English idiom. The Latin infinitive furnishes another obvious test: V. *audierunt eum fecisse hoc signum*. W. thei herden him to haue don this signe. P. thei herden that he hadde don this signe. Wyclif was no less careful to reproduce the ablative absolute than Purvey was anxious to resolve it: V. *coena facta*. W. the souper maad. P. whanne the souper was maad. Wyclif introduced numerous Latin words that never took root; e. g., *universite*, "world," etc.; but the same is true of many old English words, such as, *herie*, "to praise;" *gelding*, "eunuch." Some of his phrases, from their currency, acquired a kind of proverbial power; for instance, "strait gate," "narrow way," "beam and mote," etc. It should be borne in mind, however, that even Chaucer, that well of English undefiled, when translating from the Latin, is often very stiff and literal. It is of curious interest that the peculiar translation of Gen.

3, 7, which gave to the Genevan version the name of "The Breeches Bible," occurs also in Wyclif's, and is retained by Purvey. There are some passages that are more correctly rendered in this earliest English Bible than in our common version. 2 Tim. 3, 16 is an instance, where the older version has, "For all Scriptures inspired of God is profitable," etc. According to Wyclif, the "leaven" of Matt. 16, 6 is "sour dough," and John the Baptist was to drink neither wine nor "cider," Luke 1, 15.

That portion of the Prologue in which Purvey describes the nature and purpose of his recension is here appended. "For thoug couetouse clerkis ben woode by simonie, eresie, and manye othere synnes, and dispisen and stoppen holi writ, as myche as thei moun, git the lewid puple crieth aftir holi writ, to kunne it, and kepe it, with greet cost and peril of here lif. For these resons and othere, with comune charite to saue alle men in oure rewme, whiche God wole haue sauid, a symple creature hath translatid the bible out of Latyn into English. First, this symple creature hadde myche trauaile with diuerse felawis and helperis, to gedere manie elde biblis, and othere doctouris, and comune glosis, and to make oo Latyn bible sumdel trewe; and thanne to studie it of the newe, the text with the glose, and othere doctouris, as he migte gete, and speciali Lire on the elde testament, that helpeide ful myche in this werk; the thridde tyme to counseile with elde gramariens, and elde dyvynis, of harde wordis, and harde sentencis, hou tho migten best be vndurston den and translatid; the iiij. to translate as cleerli as he coude to the sentence, and to haue manie gode felawis and kunnynges at the correcting of the translacioun. First it is to knowe, that the best translating is out of Latyn into English, to translate aftir the sentence, and not oneli aftir the wordis, so that the sentence be as opin, either openere, in English as in Latyn, and go not fer fro the lettre; and if the lettre mai not be suid in the translating, let the sentence euere be hool and open, for the wordis owen to serue to the

entent and sentence, and ellis the wordis ben superflu either false. In translating into English, manie resolucions moun make the sentence open . . . where to Englishshe it aftir the word, wolde be derk and douteful. . . . At the bigynnyng I purposide, with Goddis helpe, to make the sentence as trewe and open in English as it is in Latyn, either more trewe and more open than it is in Latyn; and I preie, for charite and for comoun profyt of cristene soulis, that if ony wiys man fynde ony defaute of the truthe of translacioun, let him sette in the trewe sentence and opin of holi writ, but loke that he examyne truli his Latyn bible, for no doute he shal fynde ful manye biblis in Latyn ful false, if he loke manie, nameli newe; and the comune Latyn biblis han more nede to be correctid, as manie as I haue seen in my lif, than hath the English bible late translatid; and where the Ebru, bi witnesse of Jerom, of Lire, and othere expositouris discordith fro oure Latyn biblis, I haue set in the margyn, bi maner of a glose, what the Ebru hath, and hou it is vndurston dun in sum place; and I dide this most in the Sauter. . . . God, of his grete merci, geue to vs grace to lyue wel, and to seie the truthe in couenable manere, and acceptable to God and his puple, and to spille not oure tyme, be it short be it long at Goddis ordynaunce. But summe, that semen wise and holi, seyn thus, if men now weren as holi as Jerom was, thei migten translate out of Latyn into English, as he dide out of Ebru and out of Greek into Latyn, and ellis thei shulden not translate now, as hem thinkith, for defaute of holynesse and of kunnyng. . . . Myche more late the chirche of Engeland appreu the trewe and hool translacioun of symple men, that wolden for no good in erthe, bi here witting and power, putte awei the leste truthe, yea, the leste lettre, either title, of holi writ, that berith substaunce either charge. . . . Lord God! sithen at the bigynnyng of feith so manie men translatiden into Latyn, and to greet profyt of Latyn men, lat oo symple creature of God translate into English, for profyt of English men; . . . whi shulden not English

men haue the same in here modir langage, I can not wite, no but for falsnesse and necgligence of clerkis. . . . God graunte to us alle grace to kunne wel, and kepe wel holi writ, and suffre ioiefulli sum peyne for it at the laste! Amen."

The impression produced by the new versions was immediate and profound. The colporteurs of the copies were the "poor priests." Many of the extant manuscripts are not complete Bibles. The Pentateuch, the Psalter, the Gospels, the Epistles, occur in separate editions. A table of the Lessons of the church service was inserted in some copies, and the passages were marked in the text by letters or rubrics in the margin. Some copies contain only the pericopes. If anything beside the cost distinguished the Lollard Bibles, it was an occasional preface or prologue with the Lollard heresies. Most of the early copies are small in size, and show no attempt at artistic workmanship, being intended for use rather than ornament. Soon also the wealthy grew anxious to possess "Goddis lawe," and thus ornate copies were executed with all the skill of the scriptorium. Knighton's bitter complaint that Wyclif had made the Gospel vulgar and common shows that the versions were so generally read as to be dangerous to the clergy. At first, the bishops, lacking power, were silent. But, in 1408, the Convocation at Oxford passed its far-reaching resolution, and the years that followed brought evil days for the Lollards. Wyclif's bones were exhumed and burned, and the fury of persecution fell upon his followers. But the transcribing of manuscripts still went on in secret. Although to own an English Bible "unbeknownst" meant to jeopardize one's life, yet many were ready to take the risk, so that numerous copies were produced after 1408. Copies of the New Testament were borrowed from hand to hand, or bought in partnership. Some owned only parts, like the Gospels, or only stray leaves. A load of hay was given for the loan of a few leaves of St. James or St. Paul. Copies were made, though the cost of a New Testament was equal to the salary of a curate

for a year. These Scriptures were often read at night, and eagerly listened to by such as could not read. Certain persons learned portions by heart, and recited them to their families and friends. Readers of the Bible were numerous in London, where they had several places of meeting, and they abounded also in the counties of Lincoln, Essex, Norfolk, Suffolk, Buckingham, and Hereford. Even in Scotland the copies were secretly circulated. Of the numerous manuscripts that once existed many no doubt perished from use, others were lost by being destroyed or concealed by their owners to avoid detection, and not a few were burned. Hence only 170 manuscripts have come down to us. And yet this is nearly four times the number of manuscripts extant of so popular a work as Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales*.

Thus this book of the first English Reformer became truly a popular book, the people's literature. And no doubt many found in it the salvation of their souls. Especially Purvey's recension exerted an influence somewhat akin to that of Luther's translation. When we consider how the language of a Bible molds both the spoken and the written language, we may ascribe to this version an influence not inferior to Chaucer's in establishing the position of the East Midland dialect as standard English. Thus the Bible language of the fourteenth century has become largely our own. Hence it is not so surprising that "not many years ago when the experiment of reading Wycliffe's translation aloud was tried in Yorkshire, there was hardly a word or an expression which seemed at all peculiar." (Eadie.) To illustrate how these Bibles would affect literary men, we can point to Pecock, the author of the *Repressour of over-much Blaming the Clergy*, who frequently cites from Purvey's version and sometimes from other Wyclif manuscripts. Purvey's New Testament was later rendered also into the Scots vernacular of the early sixteenth century. The author, though unknown, was probably an Ayrshire Lollard. The manuscript was edited, 1899—1900, for the Scottish Text Society by

Dr. Thomas Graves Law. The vocabulary follows Purvey very closely, introducing changes only where Purvey's English would have been unintelligible or unfamiliar north of the Tweed. It is pretty certain that the old Bible exerted little direct influence on Tindale. Tindale himself makes the statement: "I had no man to counterfet, neither was holpe with englysshe of eny that had interpreted the same, or soche lyke thinge in the scripture beforetyme." (*Epistle to the Reder*, 2. Test. Worm., 1526.) The striking similarity in many passages of the King James version to the Wyclif-Purvey Bible may, therefore, partly be due to the popular speech, which had been strongly colored by many an old Scriptural phrase, and partly to the influence of the Rheims-Douay New Testament, translated in 1582 by Romanists, and made, like Wyclif's, directly from the Vulgate.

During the gloom that went before the glorious day of the Reformation there were not wanting those that valued "Goddis lawe" dearer than life itself. Their example should teach us to prize as our dearest treasure the Word of our God, which liveth and abideth for ever. "God graunte to us alle grace to kunne wel, and kepe wel holi writ, and suffre ioiefulli sum payne for it at the laste."

C. ABBETMEYER.

THE SUNDAY QUESTION.

The Sunday question is undoubtedly an important one at this time. The result of elections of state and city officials is often determined by the candidate's and the voter's position with regard to Sunday and the laws that deal with it.

The Sunday question may be treated from a purely political, economical, and humanitarian view-point. If this were always done, a theological quarterly need not give space to a discussion of it. But this is not always done. On the contrary, the Sunday question is originally the outcome of a religious movement, and even at the present time

it is generally agitated by the force of religious conviction, supported by the power of political aspirations. The chief agitators for a "Puritanic," Sabbath-like Sunday claim to be engaged in enforcing a permanent divine precept. As they see it, anything but total abstinence from work and pleasure on Sunday is a sin against God's holy Law, which is binding on all men. Sunday, they say, is substituted for the Jewish Sabbath as a day of rest, in which no burden shall be borne, in which works of piety and charity alone shall be done. And the Jewish Sabbath, according to them, was instituted for all time by God Himself when He ceased creating new things, and in the Decalogue its observance was again enjoined by Him on all men. The only change that has been made in the Sabbath law, they say, is the substitution of the first day of the week for the seventh.

Now all Christians will gladly obey their country's laws, and will joyfully hail a quiet, "closed" Sunday. But there are many that will not look upon Sunday as a day that must be kept as a day of rest by reason of God's commandment. They will not consider themselves bound to observe one day of seven as a day of rest because the Israelites were obliged to do so after they had been led out of Egypt. They will regard the commandment to keep a weekly Sabbath as given only to the Israelites, and as being in force only from the time of the exodus to Christ's resurrection.

These Christians are right. God did not institute the Sabbath as an ordinance *to be kept by man*, when He blessed (hallowed) the seventh day, Gen. 2. The first intimation we have of *man being directed to rest on the seventh day* is found in Ex. 16, 4. 5. 22—30. The believers of the time that intervened between Adam's creation and Israel's journey to Canaan did certainly meet to worship God; but the Bible is absolutely silent concerning the time of their meeting. We know not whether they met daily, or weekly, or monthly; neither do we know whether they set aside a whole day for rest and worship, or whether they contented themselves

with certain hours of the day, as many, if not most, of the early Gentile Christians were obliged to do.

In his *Antiquitates Apostolorum*: or, *The Lives . . . of the . . . Apostles*, etc. (London, 1675), Wm. Cave says (p. VII, § 9): "I know many with great zeal and eagerness contend, that the Sabbath or Seventh Day from the Creation was set apart and universally observed as the time of public worship, and that from the beginning of the world. But alas, the foundation upon which this opinion is built is very weak and sandy, having nothing to rely on but one place where it is said (Gen. 2, 3) that God, resting on the Seventh Day from all His works, blessed the Seventh Day and sanctified it. . . . For that it should be meant of a weekly Sabbath hath as little countenance from this text, as it hath from the practice of those times, there being no footsteps or shadow of any such Sabbath kept through all the Patriarchal periods of the Church, till the times of Moses, which, besides the evidence of the story, is universally owned by the ancient Jews, and very many of the Fathers do expressly assert it."

Gen. 2, 3 has been variously explained, and it is not within the scope of this article to find its real meaning. But one thing may be done—we may confidently call attention to the fact that the text in question contains not a single syllable that can be construed as establishing the Sabbath or any other day as a holy-day to be observed by man. Man is not mentioned at all, neither is a weekly seventh day mentioned, and not the remotest hint of man's obligation to keep the Sabbath is given. But if this text were a Sabbath-day precept, it would bind us to keep the Sabbath, Saturday, and not Sunday, the day on which God worked.

The attempt is often made to press Gen. 2, 3 into service as a proof of the divine institution at the beginning of the world, by referring to marriage. Marriage and the Sabbath, they say, were instituted at the same time in Paradise, and therefore both are established for all time and for

all men.—We reply that marriage was instituted by the creation of woman. Hence, they that assert an analogy between marriage and the Sabbath must point out the actual features that distinguish the Sabbath from other days, as woman is distinguished from man; they must show that the nature of the Sabbath differs from that of the other six days, just as the nature of woman differs from that of man. If this can be shown, then this seventh day, being in its nature as different from other days as woman is from man, must be kept as a holy-day, and not any other day.—Besides this, it must be remembered that all men are commanded by God to keep the Sabbath, and that they sin that keep it not. Now, if the analogy supposed to exist between marriage and the Sabbath holds good, then all men are commanded to marry, and they that fail to do so commit a sin. Need we say that He who said (Matt. 3, 15): "It becometh us to fulfill all righteousness," never married? Did He fail to fulfill all righteousness? No! With reference to the matter in hand, there is no analogy between marriage and the Sabbath; the simile not only limps, but has no feet at all to stand on.

There is an old law of evidence and interpretation, that he who would prove a proposition from a record must show that the words of the record not only *may* be understood in a certain sense, but that they *must* be so understood. Tried by this law, they that would prove the Sabbath precept binding on all men from Gen. 2 fail utterly. For Gen. 2 not only *must* not be understood as containing a permanent Sabbath precept, but cannot even be so understood. For, as has already been stated, it says nothing of a number of Sabbaths that come once a week, but speaks of that one seventh day that followed the six days of creation; it makes no mention of man in connection with that day or with rest; man is not referred to at all; finally, it contains no law, commandment, or precept of any kind.

It is claimed that the Sabbath precept, *i. e.*, the commandment to devote one day out of seven to sacred rest,

must be permanent and binding on all men, because it is contained in the Decalogue. This presupposes that whatever is contained in the Decalogue is equally applicable to all mankind. If that were really the case, all mankind must have been brought out of Egypt, out of the house of bondage. See Ex. 20, 2 and Deut. 5, 6. The introduction of the Decalogue, contained in the two texts here referred to, plainly shows that it is first of all addressed to the Israelites. It invites us to examine into the nature of the Decalogue's commandments, and to apply to ourselves what is of permanently binding force, and to pass over what is transitory and intended only for those who were under the legal covenant of the time before Christ's advent. This examination will show that the commandment enjoining the observation of the seventh day of the week as a day of rest is transitory in its nature, and has passed away with the old legal covenant to which it belonged. We say "the seventh day of the week;" for one may search the Bible from cover to cover, but he will never find a word commanding the observation of any other of the seven week days as a day of rest. The day spoken of as the prescribed weekly holy-day is the seventh day, our Saturday, and no other.

Now to the examination. The Decalogue as published on Mount Sinai was the reiteration of old truths in a new garb, so to speak. With reference to portions of its statements it can be clearly proved from Scripture that the knowledge thereof existed among the generations before Moses and before the Flood. Considering the particular references of the Lawgiver on Sinai to the history of the people of Israel, one might be tempted to call the Decalogue an edition of the primeval law of the world for the use of the Jews. Its language was not applicable to all men at all times. Hence, St. Paul renders the Fourth Commandment in a different form from Moses. Both Christ and St. Paul have changed the order of the commandments in the Decalogue. By so doing they have not changed the

original Law of God to all men, but they did change the Jewish form of that Law. We must learn to distinguish between the Law and the Decalogue. While the Decalogue restates the Law, not every word in the Decalogue is part of the original Law of God to men. It behooves us, then, with Luther, to distinguish between the "Jewish ornament" of the Law, and the universally applicable portions thereof.

With regard to the Third Commandment this is made easy for us, because both in the Gospels and in the Epistles the question of what was binding in the Sabbath law of the Jews upon Christians, and what was not, is frequently the very subject matter of the Lord's discourse and the apostle's instruction. Neither the form nor the day of the Jewish Sabbath celebration was acknowledged as binding upon the followers of Christ. This fact is constantly lost sight of by those who regard the Christian Sunday as the continuation and the substitute in every respect of the Jewish Sabbath. We are reminded again and again that the moral law of God cannot be changed. *Ergo*. We are not ready by any means to grant the major, but we are prepared to utterly deny the minor. Setting aside the question whether the moral law can be changed or has ever been changed, mark you, by God, the sovereign Lawgiver Himself, we would simply point to the indisputable fact, that there is in the New Testament a clear and emphatic release both from the form and the day of the Jewish Sabbath. Of what avail can it be to speak of what God can do or ought to do, when there is a plain declaration before us of what God has done?

In defense of His alleged criminal conduct with regard to the observation of the Jewish Sabbath, the Lord states: "The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath." When God created man, His aim was not to get a church-goer, a performer of certain acts of devotion and piety upon a certain day, but He had created man centuries before there was a Sabbath law, and when the first Sabbath

law was published, the aim was thereby to benefit man, to afford him an opportunity for resting from his labor and for restoring his soul. The Sabbath was never instituted to be an end in itself, but only a means to an end. The believing Jew while observing the Sabbath law in all its rigor was superior to the Sabbath law.

Speaking of days of rest and worship, St. Paul tells the Romans (14, 5. 6): "One man esteemeth one day above another; another esteemeth every day alike. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind. He that regardeth the day, regardeth it unto the Lord; and he that regardeth not the day, to the Lord he doth not regard it." How could St. Paul have written this if God had commanded all men of all times to set apart the seventh day, or any one of the seven days of the week, as a day of rest and worship, and so to esteem one day above another? If God had already determined in His mind that one day should be esteemed above another, could the apostle consider matters satisfactorily settled, if a person were only fully persuaded in his own mind, although he did not regard the day? This would certainly amount to inciting those to sin who esteemed all days alike. It would contradict the apostle's repeated exhortations to grow in the knowledge of God's will. For of what use could such knowledge be, if, while God would have one day esteemed above another, a person who esteemed every day alike was exonerated, provided he was fully persuaded in his own mind? The apostle says: "He that regardeth not the day, to the Lord regardeth he not the day," whether it be Saturday, or Sunday, or any other day. In the Lord's name, then, and to the glory of God, one may not regard the day. But if God has commanded us to regard the day, to set Saturday aside as a day of rest, or Sunday, as some Christians say, or, at least, one day out of the seven, as other Christians say, can one really "regard *not* the day" "*to the Lord*"? No. It follows, therefore, that whatever others may think, the in-

spired apostle certainly considered all laws that enjoin observance of certain days not only as transitory, but as already abrogated. With this one text he sweeps away the theory that one day of the week must be kept holy, and that, after Christ's resurrection, *God* substituted the Lord's day for the Jewish Sabbath. He will have all days esteemed alike, and will have the Christian who regards *not* the day received as one who thereby gives glory to God.

In Col. 2, 16. 17 St. Paul sets forth the chief purpose of the Sabbath, and, at the same time, shows that it is now abolished. He says: "Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holy-day, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath days; which are a shadow of things to come; but the body is of Christ." All the Jewish feast days without exception, among them the Sabbath, are placed on a level with various kinds of meat and drink. In our time of the new covenant a man should no more let another judge him with regard to the observance or non-observance of a day of sacred rest than he should with regard to the food he eats or does not eat. He may eat any kind of flesh-food, or none at all; and he may observe a certain day, or days, of rest, or none at all: there is no divine law in his heart or in the Bible by which he could be judged in this. All laws concerning holy-days of any kind that are contained in the Bible are revoked and abrogated by the Lawgiver Himself, just as the laws concerning meat and drink are canceled. The purpose for which they were given has been attained. They served as "shadows of things to come; but the body is of Christ." The shadow is of no use when the body is present and the things have come. And now the things that were foreshadowed by the Sabbath law, and laws of its kind, have come. Christ being present with all His grace and gifts, why should we cling to the shadow? Let the shadow pass unheeded, the law that would compel us to observe Saturday, or Sunday, or any other day, as a sacred day of rest instituted by God,

and let us retain the body, which is of Christ. One may keep a day as a day of rest and worship, as we do Sunday; but he must not believe that he is keeping that old commandment that compelled the Israelites to esteem one day above another. If he does, he is in danger of losing Christ and retaining nothing but the shadow. This is what the apostle tells the Colossians. And he repeats it in his epistle to the Galatians.

Gal. 4, 10, 11 we read: "Ye observe days, and months, and times, and years. I am afraid of you, lest I have bestowed upon you labor in vain." The days etc. spoken of in this text are the days of sacred rest, observed by the Israelites, the Sabbath included. The Galatians were beginning to observe days, etc., and among them the Sabbath, as if God had commanded them to do so, and as if it were a sin not to do so. But instead of praising them for being so conscientious the apostle rebukes them. He tells them that they are not growing in Christian life, but that their observance of the Sabbath as a divine institution still in force causes him to fear lest all the labor he had spent on them as a preacher of the crucified Christ had been spent in vain, and they had lost Christ and His salvation. "All Judaical feasts, the Sabbath included, were obliterated by the sponge which Jesus tasted on the cross; the Sabbath was within the manuscript of ordinances, and there it was canceled." (Jer. Taylor.) The Sabbath was but a shadow. If they continued embracing that, Christ, the true body, would slip from their hands, and they would be left with their sins and their guilt. This is the sense of the apostle's words.

Would a servant of the Lord have told the believers of the old dispensation that they were in danger of losing righteousness and salvation if they kept the Sabbath as a day God had commanded them to keep? No; rather would he have urged them to keep it; for the Sabbath precept was a law binding upon all Israelites. And St. Paul would have urged the Galatians to observe the Sabbath as a sacred day, if that law had still been in force. But it was no longer in

force. It is abolished, obliterated, canceled by the coming of Christ. All days are now alike, and they that are known of God must not turn again to the weak and beggarly elements to be in bondage to them, Gal. 4, 9, of which they were delivered by Jesus.

We heed the warning of the Lord's chosen vessel. We gladly gather in the sanctuary on Sunday, in order to be fed with the bread of life; but we do so willingly, knowing that for us neither Saturday nor Sunday is appointed of the Lord as a day to be esteemed above other days. A. B.

MISSIVE AGAINST THE SABBATARIANS ADDRESSED TO A GOOD FRIEND.

By DR. MARTIN LUTHER. A. D. 1538.

Grace and peace in Christ:—

I have received your communication and the oral request of your messenger, but on account of unavoidable hindrances have not been able to answer as promptly as I should have liked and had promised to do. For this I ask your indulgence.

Now, as regards your information, that everywhere in the world the Jews are spreading their abominable doctrines, and have already misled a few Christians, causing them to submit to circumcision, and to believe that the Messiah, or Christ, is yet to come, and that the laws of the Jews must abide forever, and must, moreover, be adopted by all Gentiles, etc., on all which claims you ask to be advised how to meet them with Holy Scripture, I shall, for the present, until I have greater leisure, briefly state my advice and opinion in this letter.

In the first place, since the Jewish people have become much hardened through their rabbis, so as to be hardly capable of being won over,—for when a person even con-

victs them by Scripture, they take recourse from Scripture to their rabbis, "just as you Christians," they say, "believe your pope and his decretals" (answers which I have myself received from them, when upon a time I was engaged in discussion with them and was citing Scripture against them),—for this reason, I say, you ought to bring forward again, for the comfort of Christians, the old argument which Lyra and many others have employed, and which has not to this day been honestly answered by the Jews, although they have shamefully perverted much Scripture in the attempt, and have contradicted some of their oldest teachers; of which fact, however, I have neither time nor space to speak at present.

This is the argument: The Jews have been in exile from Jerusalem these fifteen hundred years, possessing neither temple, divine service, priesthood, nor royalty; and their law, together with the city of Jerusalem and the entire Jewish monarchy, is in ruins this long time. This they cannot deny, because their miserable condition and experience, and the place, which is still named Jerusalem this day, lying waste and stripped of Jewry before the eyes of the whole world, argues the point too well and too forcibly against them. Now, they cannot, you know, keep the law of Moses except at Jerusalem only, as they themselves know and are compelled to own. For their priesthood, royalty, temple, sacrifices, and whatever Moses by divine command has appointed for their use and with reference to them, they cannot hope to maintain outside of Jerusalem. This is one point, and it is sure indeed.

Basing on this you ought to inquire: What may that sin be, and what its name, on account of which God so terribly chastises them, as to keep them in exile such a long time, without their sacerdotal and royal, *i. e.*, without their Mosaic institutions and government, without sacrifices and other ordinances of the law, especially without the possession of Jerusalem; when, in truth, the promise of God

is still standing, which they also boast, viz., that their law shall abide forever, and Jerusalem shall be God's peculiar dwelling-place, and that there shall be at all times before God both princes from the house of David and priests from among the Levites, in which promises the prophets and Scripture abound, as they know and, as I have stated, boast. And yet this glorious, powerful, and manifold promise has failed these fifteen hundred years, and they themselves sadly feel it.

Now, inasmuch as it is absurd to lay the blame on God, claiming that He has not kept His promise, and has lied for fifteen hundred years, you should ask where the fault lies, since it is impossible that God should lie or deceive. They shall and must reply, that the blame rests on their sins, and that when they shall have atoned for them, God will keep His promise and send the Messiah. On this point, as I stated before, you ought to insist, and demand what the name of that sin is. For such horrible, protracted, and grievous punishment indicates that they must have a grievous and horrible sin resting upon them, the like of which has not been heard of since the world began. For never has God plagued even pagans such a long time, but has dispatched them in a trice; how is it possible, then, that He should torture His own people such a long time, and that in such a manner that they do not see and cannot see the end of it yet?

Now, it amounts to nothing when they say that it is done on account of their sins, and yet are unable to name those sins. They might with better reason claim that they had committed no sin, because they are not able to name any sins, have no knowledge of their guilt, and, hence, seem to be unjustly punished by God. Accordingly, you should strenuously urge this point that they must name that sin. If they will not do it, you have gained this much, that they are seen to prevaricate and are not to be trusted.

If they do name the sin, observe them well: for this argument hurts them. If I were a Jew myself, born from

the very body of Abraham and most carefully instructed by Moses, verily, I should not know how to answer it, and should be forced to forsake the entire Mosaical Jewish ordinances and become God knows what.

Some of their rabbis, in order to blind their poor people with some comfort, make this reply: That sin is their fathers' worshipping the golden calf in the desert; for this sin they must now make atonement, until etc. Is not this fearful blindness? How does this answer run in the ears of people who read their Scriptures? For if that sin is so great, why, then, has God later shown such favors to the people of Israel, why has He continually performed such miracles by prophets, kings, yea, by peasants and women, as the books of Moses, Joshua, Judges, Kings, etc., witness? All these things He should surely not have done, if He had not graciously forgiven all their sins, not mentioning at all this one, for which atonement was made at the time. Why did He not at that time, as He is now doing, forsake His people on account of that sin? Why did He, regardless of that sin, bring them into the promised land, show them every favor, exalt and honor them above all the Gentiles? If He withholds the Messiah at the present time on account of that sin, which was atoned for at the time, He might have said even at that time: "I will not bring you into the land, nor honor you as highly, as I had promised; for you have committed a sin which I will nevermore forget nor forgive."

But if at that time He did not allow any sin to prevent Him from fulfilling His promise spoken to Abraham,—even as He has never omitted His promise on account of man's sin,—how could He now on account of this one sin withhold the Messiah such a long time, whom yet He promised to send by such glorious prophecies as these, viz., that the throne of David and the sacrifices of priests should never cease before Him? Ah, there occurred in those days under the rule of Moses a great many other sins, *e. g.*, that com-

mitted with Baal Peor and with tempting God many a time, as the books of Moses show; why do they not refer to those sins also? Tell these Jews, my dear friend, that their argument is pure knave's work, and they themselves know it, or ought to know it.

Moreover, at that time the Messiah had not been promised to David, so that the sin with the calf cannot be of any moment here. Hence, make them name other sins on account of which they suffer such woeful misery. If they name one or more, I kindly ask you to inform me forthwith, and—old foolish Christian that I am!—I shall have a stone knife made at once and turn Jew, even if I should have to circumcise not the one member alone, but also my nose and ears. But I know they cannot name any.

For here is the testimony of Scripture, which relates that, prior to the Babylonian captivity, the Jews had committed many more and greater sins than they could adduce to explain their Roman captivity. And yet the Babylonian captivity did not last more than seventy years, and during it they were strongly and greatly comforted by prophets, princes, and promises, as I shall set forth anon. During the Roman captivity, however, we find none of these things, but this terrible punishment is beheld by everybody. Tell us, whoever can, what that sin is! Tell us, dear Jew, what is that sin on account of which God keeps anger against you such a long time, and refuses to send His Messiah?

In the second place, if the Jews could even name the sin, no matter whether it were called A or B,—which, however, they cannot do,—still their case would not be improved thereby; they should still be caught in a lie. For it is written Jer. 31: "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah: not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt; which my covenant they brake, although I was an husband to them,

saith the Lord: but this shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel; After those days, saith the Lord, I will put my Law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts; and will be their God, and they shall be my people. And they shall teach no more every man his neighbor, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord: for they shall all know me, from the least of them unto the greatest of them, saith the Lord: for I will forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sin no more."

In this beautiful passage there are many points; however, since the Jews, whenever they feel that they are hit, like to skip and flutter from one point to the other, you should, for the present, reserve all other points and strongly urge only this one, on account of which the passage has been cited, viz.: The Jews claim that the advent of the Messiah is being delayed on account of their sin. Against this claim God here says that He will make another, a new covenant, or law, not like the covenant and law of Moses; and the fact that they have sinned shall not prevent Him; yea, for this very reason, because they have not kept the former covenant, He will make a new covenant, which they shall be able to keep, and will not allow their sin, or the fact that they have not kept the former covenant, to influence Him, but will graciously forgive their sin and remember it no more.

On this point you should take your stand, and hold it up to the Jews. For how shall we harmonize these claims? The Jews claim that the advent of the Messiah is being delayed, because they have not kept the covenant of God, but have sinned against it; God says: No, I will not allow the fact that they have not kept my covenant to prevent me; but my new covenant shall come all the more, because they have not kept the former covenant, in order that such sin may be forgiven and forgotten for evermore by the new covenant.

Here the question is in order: Who is lying? Is God lying or the Jews? For they contradict each other. The

Jew says, Yes; God says, No. But there is no need of questioning at all, but it is proved that the Jews lie, and that it is a vain subterfuge when they say that the Messiah is being withheld on account of their sin. And God remains truthful in His statement that He will allow no sin to hinder Him, but has kept and is still keeping His promise concerning the coming of Messiah, regardless of their sin of not having kept His covenant.

In this connection you might well refer the Jews to the ninth chapter of Deuteronomy, or the Fifth Book of Moses, where Moses in a powerful sermon, and with many words, tells them: "Speak not thou in thine heart, after that the Lord thy God has cast them out from before thee, saying, For my righteousness the Lord hath brought me in to possess this land: but for the wickedness of the nations the Lord doth drive them out from before thee. Not for thy righteousness, or for the uprightness of thine heart, dost thou go to possess their land: but for the wickedness of these nations the Lord thy God doth drive them out from before thee, and that He may perform the word which the Lord sware unto thy fathers, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob." As can be further seen in the same chapter, if one will read and take note.

Behold now, Moses himself testifies that the Jews were not brought into the land of Canaan either on account of their righteousness or their repentance, but on account of the promise of God, which He had made under oath to the patriarchs; nor was He prevented from keeping this oath, although the Jews by their sins should have deserved to be utterly destroyed, if He had not regarded His oath and promise. Likewise in his prayer, in the same chapter, Moses indicates that he appeased God's anger with one word, pleading that God should remember Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, who were then long dead, but whose memory, on account of the promise made to them, was still alive and all-efficient with God, etc.

Now, if God at that time did not suffer the horrible sin of the people to prevent Him from keeping His promise, and from bringing them into the land at a time when the sin of the people was manifest, and had been clearly named and recognized, as everybody can see in the Scriptures, why should He now, far beyond the due time, delay, or rather not keep, those glorious and mighty promises concerning the Messiah, on account of the people's sin, which they themselves do not know, and are not able to name and recognize, and which no Scripture indicates nor man can reason out? Why should God on account of an unknown sin of the Jews become a liar?

And why should good king David, on account of the sin of the Jews, suffer a forfeiture of the divine promises confirmed to him by an oath? Especially, since his own sins, which he has committed and which are plainly read and named in the Scriptures (such as his adultery, the murder of his faithful servant Uriah, his blasphemy, etc.) did in no wise retard the promises of God; for David rejoicingly repeats them on his deathbed in his last words and testament, saying: "He hath made with me an everlasting covenant, ordered in all things, and sure," as we read in the 23. chapter of 2. Samuel; and at the same time he predicted that the ungodly, unbelieving Jews would be cast out and perish.

Yea, why should the chief patriarch Abraham, who was a holier man than David and did not sin after his call from Chaldea, suffer on account of the sins of his posterity, that the promise of God should not be fulfilled to him, which had been repeatedly given him long before a Jew or a people of Israel had been born, much less had sinned? The same may be said of Isaac and Jacob, to whom He has also made and confirmed this promise, and on account of which He calls Himself the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob throughout the Scriptures. Nor can He, indeed, have ceased to be their God, and become a liar, on account of their disobedient chil-

dren and posterity (as Moses calls them), but the Jews make themselves liars and blasphemers by such a lame subterfuge.

Finally, the First Commandment states that God will be angry with the disobedient children of Israel, to whom that commandment was given, to the third and fourth generation. But the Jews are under the wrath of God fifteen hundred years, and there is still no end; and these long years carry our calculation much further than the third and fourth generation; nor have Gentiles ever been visited for such a long time, who never have had any promises from God; why, then, should God so shamefully forget, and so long delay the promise made to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, David, and all the prophets, and, moreover, not yet indicate when this misery shall have an end? For there is abundant Scripture for this point that God promises to be and remain the God of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and their seed, and that the throne of David shall not fall nor fail, while it is fallen and has failed these fifteen hundred years, as they are themselves compelled to feel and grasp, though they are loath to see and hear it.

Inasmuch, then, as it is clear and manifest that the Jews cannot name a sin on account of which God delays His promise so long, and they are seen, accordingly, to have lied in this point, and inasmuch as they should still be shown to be liars, though they should be able to name one or more sins, because God convicts them with the statement, that He will not omit His promise to send the Messiah and to preserve the throne of David forever on account of their sins:—therefore, it follows, with great force, that either of two things must be true: either the Messiah must have come fifteen hundred years ago, or, — may I be pardoned for such shameful talk! — God must have lied and not have kept His promise. I repeat it, Messiah must have come fifteen hundred years ago, when the throne of David, the royal house of Judah, the priesthood of Israel, the temple, and Jerusalem were still in existence, and the law of Moses with its

appointed form of worship was still in fore, and the people were still living together under their government at Jerusalem, before everything began to decline and to be destroyed in such an appalling manner; or else, God has lied. This conclusion those Jews who are still in possession of their reason cannot gainsay; the hardened party among them, however, may turn and twist, writhe and squirm, and employ all manner of cunning artifices, still their recourse and subterfuge is vain over and against such a plain truth.

Now, if Messiah is come, and God's promise has been kept and fulfilled, but the Jews have not accepted and believed it, but have continually charged God with falsehood by their unbelief, it is small wonder, to be sure, that the wrath of God has destroyed them, has laid them low together with the city of Jerusalem, the temple, their law, their princely house, their priesthood, has dispersed them among all the Gentiles, and still does not cease afflicting them, while they continue by their unbelief and disobedience to charge lies and to blaspheme against the divine promise and its fulfillment. For they should have accepted from the Messiah the new covenant, of which Jeremiah had spoken, and should have received the Messiah; He had been commissioned to teach them aright concerning the throne of David, the priesthood, the law of Moses, the temple, and all things, as Moses writes, Deut. 18, 15. 18: "The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a Prophet from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me; unto Him ye shall hearken." For God says, that He will "put His words into this Prophet's mouth and speak with them."

They might here raise the objection, that God has on several occasions delayed His help on account of sin, *e. g.*, when He suffered them to be afflicted such a long time in Egypt, and afterwards in the desert changed the forty days of their proposed journey to forty years, and finally, when He left them in exile and prison at Babylon seventy years, etc. Now, when they bring forward this argument, they just run

into your hands, and you should accept their argument, in order that you may again take them in a manifest lie and false subterfuge; and you should reply to them, thus:—

God does indeed punish sinners; He also afflicts His beloved saints with misfortune; but He does not suffer His promise to become a lie, nor to fail; for He is Himself, and essentially, truth, and not capable of lying. Accordingly, when He suffered the children of Israel to be afflicted and tried in Egypt, He still did not allow His promise to fail. Yea, and what is more, before the children of Israel had been begotten or born, even before Abraham had a child, God took such diligent care of them, that He announced and promised to Abraham, Gen. 15, that his seed, which did not yet exist, would be in exile four hundred years, and would then go forth much enriched. This promise He has verily kept, and has after four hundred years led them out of their Egyptian exile, although there was sin enough; for they resisted Moses violently enough, as they themselves boast, Ex. 14, 12.

A like promise, however, regarding their present exile the Jews have not, and never have had. Moreover, in those days God gave to the children of Israel patriarchs, who were great prophets, and sent Joseph ahead of them, who had to engage quarters for them, in order that they might receive an honorable reception before their exile, and thus God was continually with them, maintaining His prophecy and promise, so that they were certain that they would be led out of Egypt; which fact Joseph also stated on his deathbed and, accordingly, directed his bones to be taken with them out of Egypt.

However, in this their latest Roman exile we behold none of these features; there is no prophet, nor have they a prophecy from Scripture as to the duration of this exile, and must thus suffer miserable affliction for an indefinite time, wandering aimlessly about, without prophets and the Word of God,—a thing which God has never before done,

nor would He do it now, if His Messiah had not come, and His promise had not been fulfilled. For He has promised that the throne of David should not fail, and that the sacrifice of the priesthood should not cease, and yet both the throne of David and the altar of Moses, together with Jerusalem, are destroyed and in ruins these fifteen hundred years, and God remains silent,—something He has not done in Egypt nor in any other exile; nor can He or will He do this, viz., suffer His promise to fail.

Likewise, in the desert, when they were vexed forty years, He did not forget His promise to Abraham, that his seed should enter the land of Canaan and occupy it for an inheritance, but He brought them into the land according to promise; however, He had not fixed a time in how many days He would bring them into the land, and if they had not sinned, they should have come in in a short time; but when they sinned He promised them, in His wrath, 'tis true, that they should not come into the land before forty years had passed, after the number of the forty days which the spies had spent in inspecting the country, and thus, on account of their grumbling, the forty days were made forty years, as the text states. Still He kept His promise, and they did enter after forty years, notwithstanding His anger against them.

Moreover, He did not in the meantime forsake them, but manifested Himself by many miracles, made the cloudy and fiery pillar do them service day and night, fed them daily with bread from heaven, gave them water from the rock, flesh of birds, did not suffer their garments and shoes to become worn, built a tabernacle, arranged the tribes of Israel, assisted Moses, Aaron, and other prophets with His presence, punished Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, conferred other blessings of like nature by which they could grasp that God was present with them, and did not forsake them on account of their sin, but faithfully kept His promise, regardless and in spite of their manifold iniquity; and their sins and iniquity in this period have all been named plainly enough, and are not unknown.

In this last exile, however, we notice none of these features: there is no sin named which they could mention; there is no prophet, no fixed time, no sign, no wonder, no public blessing, by which they could note the grace of God, nor is there any certain place or locality of their exile, as was the case in Egypt and in the desert; but they are ever in the winnowing basket, having their abode here to-day, and being driven off to-morrow, their homes destroyed, and no prophet there to tell them: Flee hither, or thither! but they are left in ignorance even as to the place of their exile, and are tossed at the mercy of the wind. All this has never happened before; for Egypt, the desert, and Babylon were certain localities where they suffered exile, and they always had the Word of God and the prophets with them, also the evident manifestation of God; but in the present instance they are, forsooth, too utterly forsaken, and the exile endures too long, the city of David lying waste, and the law of Moses being neglected in the temple at Jerusalem, where it had been appointed.

Likewise, when they were driven into the Babylonian exile God did not forget His promise, nor forsake His people, but appointed them a certain time, namely, seventy years, and a certain place, namely, Babylon, and assured them that after seventy years they should return to Jerusalem, and that their royal house and priesthood should remain. Moreover, He gave them excellent prophets, such as Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, and their fellows, by whom they were comforted and sustained during the interval; He also manifested His presence among them, and the fact that He had not forsaken them, by great blessings and miracles which He did by Daniel. For the royal personage of Jehoniah was greatly exalted at the royal court of Babylon, above all other kings; hence, the throne of David and the priesthood did not fall into desuetude, but even the persons existed to the end of the exile. Moreover, He had long before, by the prophet Isaiah, named Cyrus as their deliverer, ch. 45, which prophet also predicted many details of this

captivity, and did not conceal the sin leading up to it, but clearly named it, as also did Jeremiah, so that it is known well enough for what sin they were punished.

Accordingly, these three afflictions, or exiles, the Egyptian, that in the desert, and the Babylonian, cannot be compared with this last Roman exile; for in the former instance the sin is manifest, prophecy and promise still exist, prophets and representatives both of the throne of David and the altar of Aaron are there, and there is a fixed time. In brief, we cannot call it forsaking the people, nor forgetting the promise on God's part, when God acts toward, and treats, His people thus, takes them up so carefully, and secures them; even as we cannot call it forsaking them, when He cared for the children of Israel in Egypt before they were born, and limited the time of this exile to Abraham before he had a child. Read the 30th and 31st chapters of Jeremiah, and hear God complaining pitifully, like a wailing mother, over the exile of His people at Babylon, even before they had gone into that exile, regardless of the sin for which they were driven into that exile.

Why, then, should He so fatally forget His promise in the present exile, or allow it to fail, and act so strangely, when they have no sin that could be named? And yet, this prophecy regarding the Messiah is the most glorious and powerful, and all other prophecies, promises, and the entire law point to it, so that the other promises, as those in Egypt, in the desert, and at Babylon, must be accounted very light over and against this chief promise regarding the Messiah. Now, if God in those former instances has so strictly kept those minor promises, and has so cordially comforted the people in their lighter exiles, fixing their limit, manifesting Himself as their faithful God, by the persons He placed over them, by the blessings He bestowed upon them, and in every other manner, and caring for them unceasingly; how, then, is it possible, or credible, or conceivable, that in this dreadful, long, and great exile He should so utterly

abandon His glorious promise made to David, that his throne should remain everlasting and firm, as David boasts in his last words in the Second Book of Samuel, in the seventh chapter, and as is done in many other writings of the prophets, as in Jeremiah and Isaiah?

Let the Jews talk as much as they please about sins for which they must suffer (for they lie!), yet God did not promise with an oath an everlasting throne to their sin or righteousness, but to David. And though He should not be willing to keep His promise to the Jews on account of their sin (which, however, they do not name), still He would not lie, or be in arrears to David, to whom He has made the promise, as He says in the 88. Psalm. Now, then, inasmuch as the throne of David has been in ruins these fifteen hundred years, although according to the divine statement it was not to be destroyed nor fall, it is incontrovertible, that either Messiah must have come fifteen hundred years ago and must have taken possession of the throne of His Father, and must forever possess it, or God must have turned liar in His most glorious promise, and that on account of a wicked people, viz., the unbelieving Jews. God never was of such mind, nor ever will be; but the Jews lie in the face of God, and deceive themselves by accusing God of not having kept troth and faith to David, because He did not send the Messiah in the manner they had desired and proposed and outlined for Him.

This argument, I am convinced, must move any reasonable Jew that may still exist, and must even strike the obdurate among them somewhat. For they cannot bring forth anything against it that will stand. If it does not impress or strike them, they have nevertheless confirmed us in our faith, so that their vain and useless lies, and their insipid talk can do no harm. And if they do not fairly answer this argument, but dodge it and drift into their foolishness, as their custom is, leave them, and go home; for you can perceive by their practice that they are dealing in folly and falsehood.

(To be concluded.)